

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B

for STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act

**For reporting on
FFY 2020**

South Dakota



PART B DUE February 1, 2022

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

Introduction

Instructions

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State's systems designed to drive improved results for students with disabilities and to ensure that the State Educational Agency (SEA) and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) meet the requirements of IDEA Part B. This introduction must include descriptions of the State's General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

149

General Supervision System:

The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part B requirements are met, e.g., monitoring, dispute resolution, etc.

South Dakota (SD) implements a variety of activities to ensure that IDEA Part B requirements are met.

SD's general supervision encompasses an accountability review of local education agency (LEA) special education programs on a five-year cycle. The accountability review incorporates an analysis of compliance through State Performance Plan (SPP) indicators, state assessment accommodation verification, dispute resolution follow-up, and fiscal reviews.

Accountability Reviews

SD's accountability review cycle distributes LEAs and educational agencies over a five-year period. Each LEA accountability review includes a review of LEA child count data in comparison to state level reporting, Indicator 13 data collection, one-on-one teacher file reviews, verification of state certification of special education staff, and a representative file review across disability categories and age levels. If relevant to the LEA, an accountability review may also include a review of private school eligibility, service plans, program purchases, extraordinary cost fund program file reviews, and other relevant areas.

LEAs may receive an on-site or off-site focused review. Focused reviews are generally related to corrective action received from a state complaint or due process complaint with findings of noncompliance, disproportionality, and extraordinary cost funding. Results Driven Accountability (RDA) Coaches review specific areas related to the findings and to verify continued correction. If the LEA's performance on SPP compliance indicator(s) did not meet the target, then a focused review will occur to determine whether or not a systemic issue is present.

If noncompliance has been identified, a finding in the form of a corrective action plan (CAP) is issued by Special Education Programs (SEP). The CAP includes the specific noncompliance issue, citation of the statute or regulation, and/or data supporting the conclusion. The LEA will correct all areas of noncompliance as soon as possible, but no later than one year from the written notification. The LEA will demonstrate correction by submitting supporting documentation for the correction of each individual case identified (Prong 1) as well as documentation of correction of the regulatory requirements (Prong 2) as required by the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum. Part of the corrective action may include targeted technical assistance overseen by SEP. Correction and compliance in conformance with the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum is verified by SEP.

The accountability review process for FFY 2020 was impacted by COVID19 closures with regards to the on-site reviews only. SEP provided LEA's with the option of completing the accountability review on-site or virtually. The SPP indicator collection and verification completed during the accountability reviews was not impacted due to continued implementation of reviews during the pandemic.

Fiscal Monitoring

Fiscal monitoring includes the review and approval of the application LEAs submit to the Department of Education (DOE) to apply for IDEA 611 and 619 funds. SEP reviews each application to make certain it meets program requirements using a multi-faceted approach. SEP regional representatives complete an initial review to verify expenditures are allowable and ensure LEAs are implementing services appropriately. Once approved by SEP staff the application is sent to the assistant director for review. Once the assistant director reviews and approves the application, it is sent to the Grants Management Office where the application is reviewed to certify the budget and program costs are aligned and allowable. Grants Management also verifies that the LEA has met Maintenance of Effort (MOE) requirements. Grants Management conducts a final review before sign-off by the Grants Management Director and SEP Director.

When the DOE conducts a fiscal review of the IDEA 611 and 619 funds, the LEA submits its accounting records. Grants Management compares accounting records with reimbursement requests and the grant application for the IDEA Part B 611, IDEA Part B 619, coordinated early intervening services (CEIS), and private schools proportionate share. The following are reviewed:

1. The DOE ensures, if the LEA utilized voluntary CEIS funds up to 15%, that funds are used to provide services to non-identified students (not on an Individualized Education Plan, IEP) through fiscal review and special education accountability review. This process is also used for Comprehensive CEIS (CCEIS) requirements. The LEA separately tracks and accounts for IDEA funds used for CCEIS and CEIS in the accounting software. LEAs must submit a separate budget for these funds which are reviewed in the same manner as 611 & 619 funds. In addition, the DOE ensures that the LEA utilized voluntary CEIS funds for non-identified students (not on an IEP) through fiscal review and special education monitoring review.

2. MOE is reviewed and a determination is made as to whether the LEA is in compliance or if MOE needs to be addressed. MOE is reviewed using two different comparisons each fiscal year. The first comparison examines local, or state and local, special education budgeted expenditures to actual local, or state and local, special education expenditures from the most recent prior fiscal year for which information is available. This comparison is completed in the IDEA application, to determine if the LEA is eligible to receive the IDEA entitlement grant. The second comparison examines two fiscal years actual local, or state and local, special education expenditures to determine if the LEA is in compliance with IDEA MOE requirements. This compliance test occurs after the fiscal year has ended. If an LEA does not pass at least one of these four MOE tests, the LEA must provide documentation to the DOE explaining how one of the allowable exceptions prevented the LEA from expending the necessary amount of local or state funds to maintain effort.

If the LEA is unable to establish an allowable exception, noncompliance will be determined and the LEA will be required to pay the amount it fell below the MOE requirement to the DOE.

3. If the LEA has a private school, the DOE verifies the public LEA expended the required proportionate share indicated on the federal IDEA budget. If the LEA purchased equipment, the DOE verifies the appropriateness of the expenditure and that the LEA maintained control over all IDEA funds, property, equipment, and supplies at the private school. Also, the DOE determines whether or not the LEA used private school personnel to provide equitable services, services were performed outside of the regular duty hours and under the supervision of the public agency. DOE verifies the LEA identifies the private school expenses in their financial software and tracks it separately.

The DOE does a fiscal cross-cutting to ensure the LEA is supplementing and not supplanting federal funds. DOE checks whether or not the LEA generated any program income and compares time and effort documentation against the general ledger. If the LEA purchased equipment with federal funds, the DOE requests the property records to ensure that the equipment is reasonable and necessary to implement the IEP. During on-site accountability review, SEP confirms the item(s) purchased have been appropriately labeled and inventoried according to program requirements. The DOE identifies whether or not adequate controls are in place to ensure safeguarding and maintaining equipment (including a physical inventory reconciled at least every other year). The DOE verifies procurement is in place, and if necessary, collects documentation supporting vendor selection. If there are third-party contractors, the DOE checks to see whether or not they are approved and monitored by the LEA.

Technical Assistance System:

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to LEAs.

SEP provides technical assistance to LEAs utilizing a variety of methods to reach as many constituents as possible in the manner that best meets their needs.

Technical assistance documents are developed and maintained to help clarify policies and procedures to assist LEAs with implementing the IDEA and state requirements. The documents are posted on the SEP webpage at <https://doe.sd.gov/sped> and shared with constituents at conferences and during trainings, and notices of availability are sent on the special education listserv. Monthly Special Education Director Webinars are provided, recorded, and posted for later reference. Webinar topics include upcoming data collections, TA on needed areas identified through monitoring or complaints, and updates on policies. SEP keeps open lines of communication with LEAs through topical listservs and assigned region representatives. This guarantees that all constituents are able to access prompt, high-quality technical support.

In order to provide topical and in-depth assistance, SEP utilizes a portion of the state level IDEA allocation for contracted specialists. The areas these contractors directly support LEAs includes (but is not limited to):

1. RDA Coaches. These individuals are contracted through educational cooperatives to conduct accountability reviews. They also conduct regional training around IEP and high school transition for teachers, present at teacher preparation programs, and conduct training related to CAPs. RDA coaches support the implementation of the RDA project that began in the 2017-2018 school year with full implementation in FFY 2021.

2. Transition Services Liaison Project (TSLP). This program is a collaborative partnership between the DOE and the Department of Human Services (Division of Rehabilitation Services). TSLP staff are regionally located and focus on supporting high school transition. They make one-on-one connections with high school special education teachers and personnel. They provide technical assistance in writing compliant IEPs, locate resources for evidence-based practices, and link adult agencies with LEA personnel, students and families.

3. Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) Coordinators. These individuals work directly with LEAs to implement a continuous-improvement framework in which data-based problem-solving and decision-making are practiced across all levels of the educational system for supporting students. The coordinators are trained in Response to Intervention (RtI) and Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) processes.

4. Educational cooperatives and the Center for Disabilities. These organizations provide specialized training and technical assistance in areas of regional and statewide need as identified through monitoring and LEA input.

5. The Navigator Program. This program is contracted through South Dakota Parent Connection (SDPC), the States OSEP funded parent training and information center (PTI). Each Navigator Program consultant serves as an objective and neutral party while assisting parents and school personnel. Navigators also assist in locating and utilizing information, improving communication, building (or re-building) partnerships, and making progress towards mutual agreements. SDPC develops and presents to parents and LEAs on a variety of topics based on the types of cases they are taking on and issues SEP identifies through accountability reviews and the dispute resolution process. <https://doe.sd.gov/sped/navigator.aspx>

Professional Development System:

The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for children with disabilities.

Professional development is provided in a variety of ways due to SD's large area and rural nature. SD has 77,116 square miles and 149 LEAs. The LEAs are differentiated by the total student population with 30 that have an enrollment of 200 or less, 79 have an enrollment between 201 and 600, and 40 have an enrollment of over 600. Trainings are offered in a variety of formats including state level, regionally, and virtually which allows LEA staff to access appropriate professional development. SEP professional development revolves around data collection, the IEP process, behavior, response to intervention, instructional coaching, early childhood and other pertinent areas. Professional development areas are identified through monitoring, LEA input, and input from the stakeholder groups (including the South Dakota Advisory Panel for Children with Disabilities (SDAPCD) and SDPC).

IEP process workshops are held every fall across SD. In the fall of 2020, SEP offered several opportunities for basic, transition and early childhood IEP workshops virtually due to limitations with offering in-person training due to the COVID19. IEP basic targets new special education staff and covers the IEP process from referral, evaluation, eligibility to IEP development. Approximately 100 LEA staff statewide attended the basic workshop. The advanced IEP workshop was canceled due to COVID19. The transition IEP workshop covers high school transition and IEP processes. The transition workshop had approximately 67 LEA staff attend. The early childhood workshop focuses on Part C to Part B transition, preschool outcomes, and least restrictive environments. There were approximately 69 LEA staff that attended the early childhood workshop.

SEP develops a monthly newsletter, distributes it through the listserv, and posts it to the web. The newsletter includes SEP highlights, federal updates, the agenda for monthly Special Education Director webinars, and features disability specific resources for LEAs and parents. The newsletter includes professional development opportunities available for teachers and administrators. A Special Education Director webinar is held every third Tuesday of the month and is recorded for viewing later at <https://doe.sd.gov/sped/directors.aspx>. The webinars inform special education directors and other interested parties about information and changes at the federal and state level, initiatives, data collection, and other DOE information.

SEP partners with Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE) to offer webinar training on specialized topics. Topics include challenges in evaluating, classifying and programming for English learners, individual health plans, parental prior written notice (PPWN), transportation, surrogate parents, Who is the Parent, accommodations, legal updates, general educators role in special education, and discipline. A new special education director webinar series is conducted every two-years targeting five areas of general supervision including the state performance plan, budget and fiscal, dispute resolution, accountability, and child count. All TAESE webinar recordings and handouts mentioned above are posted at <https://doe.sd.gov/sped/webinars.aspx>.

Face-to-face training occurs regionally around the state throughout the school year. Training spans a variety of topics, including (but not limited to) discipline, struggling readers (dyslexia), early childhood, writing effective behavior plans, writing standards-based IEPs, facilitation of IEP meetings, transition training, parental engagement and connecting with youth, and instructional strategies. Due to COVID19, trainings were primarily conducted virtually instead of in-person.

SEP sponsors speakers at conferences of partnering organizations focused on meeting the needs of students with disabilities. These include the Youth Leadership Forum (YLF), the Early Childhood conference, and SD Speech and Language Pathologist Association conference. SEP hosts two major conferences each year, Special Education Conference and Summer Conference. One targets special education professionals, and the other targets all educators with a focus on making learning accessible for all students. YLF, the Early Childhood conference, special education conference and summer conferences were held virtually due to COVID19.

Entities such as the Center for Disabilities provide frequent and timely feedback and technical assistance through Skype, Facetime, and other avenues to parents and LEAs. Other professional development offered included training on meeting the needs of students with Autism and other challenging behaviors, administration of the Autism Diagnostic Observation Schedule (ADOS), supporting mental health, Young Adult Social Skills training, and infant and early childhood mental health.

By utilizing a diverse range of technical assistance delivery methods and platforms, SEP assures access to timely and high-quality professional development for all stakeholders statewide.

Broad Stakeholder Input:

The mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

SEP values broad stakeholder representation. Stakeholder groups include representation from various departments, special education administrators, superintendents and building principals, teachers (including general and special educators), SDPC staff, professors, parents, educational cooperative staff, advisory panel members, and contractors. To establish a representative sample that reflects diversity across SD, SEP includes stakeholders from varying demographics, geographic areas and LEA enrollment sizes.

SEP met with a large stakeholder group in July of 2021 to discuss the new FFY 2020-25 SPP package, review baselines, set new targets, and gather stakeholder feedback. Invites were sent to a variety of potential participants that included parents, LEA administrators, LEA general education and special education staff, related service providers, educational cooperative staff, advisory panel members, SDPC staff, Disability Rights South Dakota (DRSD) staff (OSEP funded protection and advocacy agency), DOE staff and contractors. SEP attempted to recruit those with diverse race and ethnic backgrounds, however, those that responded and attended were limited. Although the stakeholder participants were mainly white and Native American, they did represent students of varying race and ethnicities. The stakeholders either work directly with students providing services or provide supports to students and families. Students the stakeholders serve included Native American, Caucasian, African American, Asian, Hispanic, and Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander. The stakeholder participants also represented students from all 14 disability categories.

SEP staff used the recommended baselines, targets and strategies from the large stakeholder group to present to additional stakeholder groups. On September 29, 2021 SEP staff presented to SDAPCD and solicited feedback on the proposed targets and baselines. SEP sent a follow-up email to panel members with a link to further review the indicators, proposed targets and baseline as well as a link to provide feedback. The SDAPCD is made up of parents of children with disabilities, individuals with disabilities, administrators, DRSD, vocational rehabilitation, higher education, juvenile justice, private schools, McKinney Vento, and other state agencies. The general practice of SEP is to solicit participation from a broad group representing a variety of race and ethnic backgrounds and various locations throughout the state by advertising through listservs, current advisory panel member recommendations, DRSD, SDPC, and the SEP newsletter.

SEP gathered feedback from stakeholders, then reviewed it to determine whether or not the feedback was applicable and if revisions were needed. If adjustments were needed, as discussed in the proceeding individual indicator stakeholder input sections, SEP used the reasoning and suggestions of the stakeholders to reset targets. SEP then presented the revised targets to the SDAPCD and gathered feedback on the revised targets.

The State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) workgroup convened on July 16, 2020 to review SSIP progress and provide feedback on future plans. The workgroup included educators, instructional coaches, administrators, family organizations, and staff from the division of special education and early learning. The workgroup represented white and Native American race/ethnic groups. The workgroup reviewed data from participating pilot schools. Based on the results, the workgroup recommended expanding the target population to include students with specific learning disabilities, other health impairments, and speech and language disabilities.

Indicator 17 SSIP baselines and targets were also reviewed and determined during the State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) advisory committee on September 22, 2021. SEP aligned the SSIP with MTSS and SPDG during 21-22 school year and combined stakeholders from those three to become the SPDG stakeholder group. Stakeholders included educators, administrators, family organizations, higher education representatives, and staff from several divisions of the DOE. The race/ethnicity of the stakeholder group represented primarily white. During the meeting, stakeholders reviewed data from all programs that provide literacy supports to pilot LEAs, including the SPDG, SSIP, and MTSS. The data included disaggregation by initiative, grade, and disability category. Based on the recommendations of the SSIP workgroup and data reviewed during the meeting, the advisory committee recommended a 5% increase for the SSIP targets for the all-student group as well as the subgroups of students with specific learning disabilities, other health impairments, and speech/language disabilities.

A presentation on the proposed targets for Indicator 14 Post School Outcomes was given to the Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) Board on September 9, 2021. The group is made up of members that represent individuals with disabilities, agencies who represent individuals with disabilities, Native Americans with disabilities, disability groups, parents of individuals with disabilities, businesses, advocates, and state agencies. Participants were provided a link to provide feedback.

SEP also presented the proposed baselines, targets, and improvement activities during a SDPC lunch and learn webinar for parents. SDPC sent out on their listserv the website link to review the indicators, proposed targets and baseline that also included a link to provide feedback. SDPC also shared out the information in their newsletter.

SEP developed a temporary website that contained information on all 17 indicators for the FFY 2020-25 package that was made available publicly between November 1 - 30, 2021. The results indicators included prerecorded webinars with an explanation of the indicator and any changes, proposed baseline and targets, as well as any improvement strategies. The compliance indicators included a powerpoint presentation to describe the indicator and reporting requirements and proposed targets. All Indicator presentations included a link to a feedback form for reviewers to provide feedback on the proposed targets and to provide ideas for improvement. SEP advertised the website through a statewide press release that targets approximately 250 individual recipients or entities that can further distribute information including, local news, television, and radio stations. SEP also released information via social media, listservs, DOE Secretary weekly emails, advocacy groups, Developmental Disabilities Council, SDPC, and the Tribal Education Department.

Lastly, SEP presented final baselines, targets, data, and improvement activities for all 17 indicators at the January 12, 2022 SDAPCD meeting. This meeting was also broadcast live through public broadcasting and recordings are made available at <https://boardsandcommissions.sd.gov/Meetings.aspx?BoardID=16> under the "Archived Meetings" tab.

Apply stakeholder involvement from introduction to all Part B results indicators (y/n)

NO

Number of Parent Members:

40

Parent Members Engagement:

Describe how the parent members of the State Advisory Panel, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, and individual parents were engaged in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

Parents from the SDAPCD, SDPC, DRSD, and parents of students with disabilities were invited to formal stakeholder meetings to engage in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress. Invitations were sent through a variety of means to multiple outlets that work with parents that included underrepresented populations, however there was a limited response. To assist in getting feedback from more parents, SEP developed a website for parents to access. SEP advertised the website through the statewide press release that targets approximately 250 individual recipients or entities that can further distribute information including, local news, television, and radio stations. SEP also released information via social media, listservs, DOE Secretary weekly emails, advocacy groups, developmental disabilities council, SDPC, and the Tribal Education Department.

The parents who were involved in the large stakeholder group were provided historical data, current requirements, statistical predictions, and the opportunity to discuss optional targets for consideration. The group then discussed the options and determined targets based on the information presented and their discussions. Parents had the opportunity to ask questions and provide input. The groups also discussed activities SEP should consider to improve outcomes for students with disabilities.

Parents statewide were provided an opportunity to engage through the SDPC lunch and learn as well as provided an opportunity to review the data and proposed information through the website during the public input period.

Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:

The activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents to support the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.

SEP staff met to discuss who should be involved as stakeholders for each indicator. A list of potential stakeholders was developed to include participants with a variety of race and ethnic backgrounds both as a participant and representing the student population the stakeholder works with, stakeholders with varying expertise in the 14 disability categories, parents as well as agencies who work with parents, advocates, positions based on the indicator (i.e. transition – college representative and a parent of a student with disabilities graduating), administrators from LEAs and cooperatives, teachers, Part C program, representatives from different regions of the state which included reservations, and related service professionals.

SEP also attempted to increase diverse parent involvement by advertising through SDPC, DRSD, and the Developmental Disability Council. SEP also encouraged LEAs to share out stakeholder opportunities with parents through the monthly newsletter and Special Education Director webinars. SEP staff directly contacted LEAs with diverse student populations and extended personal invitations to join stakeholder groups.

Parents statewide were also provided an opportunity to engage through the SDPC lunch and learn webinar, which was advertised by SDPC.

The prerecorded webinars and feedback forms that were developed focused on soliciting parent feedback in a way that provided them with a basic understanding of the indicator in parent friendly language and allowed them to review and provide feedback as their schedule allowed. In order to reach more parents, SEP advertised the website through a statewide press release, as well as social media, local media, SDPC, DRSD, and the state Tribal Education office.

Soliciting Public Input:

The mechanisms and timelines for soliciting public input for setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

SEP began notifying stakeholders of the changes in the SPP package in February 2021. In April of 2021, SEP began notifying stakeholders that there would be an opportunity to be involved in setting baselines and targets. Stakeholders were encouraged to reach out to SEP if they were interested in participating in the in-person large stakeholder group.

SEP developed a temporary website to solicit public input and increase involvement from parents of diverse backgrounds. The website was live from November 1, 2021 until November 30, 2021. The website included presentations of each indicator and a feedback form. SEP advertised the website through a state press release that targets approximately 250 individual recipients and entities that can further distribute information including local news, television, and radio stations, social media, listservs, SEP newsletter, SEP monthly sped director calls, DOE Secretary weekly emails, DOE main website, DRSD, Developmental Disabilities Council, SDPC, and the Tribal Education Department.

Making Results Available to the Public:

The mechanisms and timelines for making the results of the target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation available to the public.

SEP will add to the SD SPP webpage <http://doe.sd.gov/sped/SPP.aspx> a presentation on the Indicators outlining changes in the FFY 2020-25 SPP package, results of the baseline and target setting, statistical data, how the data was analyzed to determine targets, and improvement strategies identified after the SPP has been submitted to OSEP but prior to the clarification period.

Stakeholders will be notified using the state press release method used to solicit feedback, including local news, televisions, and radio stations. It is also advertised through social media, listservs, DOE Secretary weekly emails, advocacy groups, developmental disabilities council, SDPC, and the Tribal Education Department.

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2019 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2019 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2019 APR in 2021, is available.

Following the submission of the SPP/APR to the U.S. Department of Education, SEP disseminated the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, and LEA public information in the following ways:

1. Posted the final version of the SPP/APR, and LEA public reports on the SEP website at <http://doe.sd.gov/sped/SPP.aspx>. SEP publicly reports at the LEA level public reports on the required indicators as soon as practical, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its SPP/APR each year.
2. SEP utilizes the IDEA Data Center Interactive Public Reporting Engine to display the 618 public data reports. The link to the final 618 public data tables can be found on the SEP website at <https://doe.sd.gov/sped/StatePublicReports.aspx>.
3. Published Public Notices via state press release that targets approximately 250 individual recipients and entities statewide that can further distribute information to include newspapers, television stations, and radio stations to notify the public of the website <http://doe.sd.gov/sped/SPP.aspx> where the SPP/APR can be accessed. Hard copies of the reports are made available upon request.

The SEA disseminated the information by:

1. Alerting constituency groups via existing listservs, email and workshops.
2. SEP program staff presents current SPP/APR results to the SDAPCD in January of each year during the Special Education Director webinar in February.
3. SDPC shares via newsletter and weekly updates with parents directions on how to access the publication of the FFY 2019 SPP/APR on the SEP website.
4. Providing electronic copies to all SDAPCD members.
5. Providing access to alternative formats of this document (e.g., Braille, large print, hard copy, or digital) on request. Alternative forms can be requested at: South Dakota Department of Education Attn: Special Education Programs 800 Governor's Drive Pierre, SD 57501-2294

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Intro - OSEP Response

Intro - Required Actions

Indicator 1: Graduation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) exiting special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS009.

Measurement

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who exited high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma are different, please explain.

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2019	67.99%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%
Data	59.92%	60.42%	60.18%	62.98%	72.14%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	67.99%	67.99%	68.45%	68.91%	71.84%	73.67%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

FFY 2019 was selected, with stakeholder input, as the baseline as this was the first year the new SD graduation requirements went into effect. This was also the last pre-COVID data point, and therefore believed to be the most reliable data point to use as a baseline. Note that SEP indicates that the baseline graduation rate is 67.99% for FFY 2019; however, the Data Table shows the FFY 2019 graduation rate to be 72.14%. The reason for the discrepancy is that the SEP re-calculated the FFY 2019 rate to be based on EdFacts File FS009 to use the same calculation methodology that is used for the FFY 2020 graduation rate.

In determining the baseline for Indicator 1, SEP and stakeholders examined the recalculated graduated rates using the FS009 EdFacts File for several years. Stakeholders looked at previous years' data through the lens of the new calculation, which did not show a consistent trajectory of improvement or decline. Stakeholder input, which included various state and LEA demographics, centered around:

1. The impact of COVID19 - LEAs need time to recover from COVID19 closures, continued illnesses, and providing consistent services in a safe environment. Beginning in the fall of 2020 and continuing through the present, COVID19 has caused an increase in substitute teachers, turnover in staff, and absences due to student and family illnesses.
2. Students may have to re-take or take recovery courses due to failing courses that were moved to virtual instruction due to the aforementioned ongoing effects of COVID19 on LEAs; not all students learn well in a virtual learning environment.
3. Concerns were expressed regarding some LEAs remaining open while others were virtual.
4. Concern over consistency between LEAs as to how students are counted as attending school and completing coursework during COVID19 recovery years.
5. While reviewing previous years' data, stakeholders expressed concern the FFY 2020 data point, which is the first year that COVID19 would impact data (based on 2019-2020 data), was unusually high compared to previous years (and thus believed to be an anomaly) which is why the SEP and the stakeholders chose FFY 2019 (the most recent pre-COVID19 year) as the baseline.

FFY 2019 graduation data was not impacted by COVID19 because graduates in 2019-2020 graduated as anticipated during this collection period.

Stakeholders believe the ongoing effects of COVID19 will impact future data. An end target of 73% was chosen as stakeholders believed this provided adequate rigor and increased SD graduation rates. Stakeholders are aware SEP must increase outcomes over the next five years. A consistent gradual increase in targets is shown over the six-year plan giving LEAs time to recover and stabilize from COVID19.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	610
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	0
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	0
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	52
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	147

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
610	809	72.14%	67.99%	75.40%	Met target	N/A

Graduation Conditions

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma.

SD has one diploma with the ability to add an advanced, advanced career, or an advanced honors endorsement. The minimum requirements for receiving a diploma are established by SDCL 13-33-19 and ARSD 24:43:11:02.

24:43:11:02. General requirements for high school graduation. The units of credit required for high school graduation must include the following:

- (1) Four units or more of language arts that must include the following:
 - (a) One unit of writing;
 - (b) One-half unit of speech or debate; and
 - (c) One unit of literature that must include one-half unit of American literature;
- (2) Three units or more of social studies that must include the following:
 - (a) One unit of U.S. history; and
 - (b) One-half unit of U.S. government;
- (3) Three units or more of mathematics that must include one unit of algebra I;
- (4) Three units or more of science that must include one unit of biology;
- (5) One unit or more in any combination of the following:
 - (a) Approved career and technical education courses;
 - (b) A capstone experience; and
 - (c) World languages;
- (6) One-half unit of personal finance or economics;
- (7) One unit of fine arts;
- (8) One-half unit of physical education;
- (9) One-half unit of health or health integration; and
- (10) Five and one-half units of electives.

A state-approved advanced computer science course may be substituted for one unit of science, but may not be substituted for biology.

Within the coursework outlined above, a student may earn one or more advanced endorsement, but is not required to do so. A student may earn one or more of the following advanced endorsements: advanced, advanced career, and advanced honors. Substitutions for laboratory science, using a state-approved computer science course, do not apply to the advanced and advanced honors endorsements.

Students may be granted up to one credit in fine arts for participation in extracurricular activities. A maximum of one-fourth credit may be granted for each extracurricular activity each school year. In order to grant credit, a LEA must document the alignment of the activity with fine arts content standards as approved by the South Dakota Board of Education.

Academic core content credit may be earned by completing an approved career and technical education course. Approval to offer credit must be obtained through an application process with the Department of Education. The application must include:

- (1) Course syllabus;
- (2) Standards based curriculum;
- (3) Teacher certification;
- (4) Assessment of standards by methods including end-of-course exams, authentic assessment, project-based learning or rubrics.

The IEP team has the authority to modify the specific credits required for graduation. The IEP team must take into consideration the student's postsecondary goals along with the nature of the student's disability, which prevents the student from accessing the same curriculum with accommodations and supports. If a student has modified requirements they are not considered to have met the regular graduation requirements and their eligibility for FAPE is not ended.

Graduation information may be found on the SDDOE website at <https://doe.sd.gov/gradrequirements/>

Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? (yes/no)

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

This Indicator data reflects the 2019-2020 graduates. The impact of COVID19 will not be known until 2020-2021 data; LEAs need time to recover from COVID19 closures, continued illnesses may directly impact course credits earned, as well as the continued challenge of providing consistent services within a safe environment. COVID19 caused an increase in substitute teachers, turnover in staff, and absences due to student and family illnesses beginning the fall of 2020.

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

1 - OSEP Response

.

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

OPTION 1:

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS009.

OPTION 2 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

Measurement

OPTION 1:

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

OPTION 2 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), and compare the results to the target.

With the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, States may use either option 1 or 2. States using Option 2 must provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

OPTION 1:

Use 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved, but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

OPTION 2:

Use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's Common Core of Data.

If the State has made or proposes to make changes to the data source or measurement under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012, the State should include a justification as to why such changes are warranted.

Options 1 and 2:

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth. Please explain if there is a difference between what counts as dropping out for all students and what counts as dropping out for students with IEPs.

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, States must report data using Option 1 (i.e., the same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA). Option 2 will not be available beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2019	19.35%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target <=	2.90%	2.80%	2.50%	2.40%	2.40%
Data	3.03%	3.09%	3.30%	3.01%	2.55%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	19.35%	19.35%	18.38%	17.40%	14.60%	10.70%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

FFY 2019 was selected, with stakeholder input, as the baseline as this was the first year the new SD graduation requirements went into effect. This was also the last pre-COVID19 data point and therefore believed to be the most reliable data point to use as a baseline. Note that SEP indicates that the baseline drop-out rate is 19.35% for FFY 2019; however, the Data Table shows the FFY 2019 drop-out rate to be 2.55%. The reason for the discrepancy is that SEP recalculated the FFY 2019 rate to be based on EdFacts File FS009 in order to use the same calculation methodology that is used for the FFY 2020 drop-out rate.

In determining what the baseline was for Indicator 2, the SEP and stakeholders examined recalculated drop-out rates using the FS009 EdFacts File for several years. The FFY 2020 data point, which is the first year that COVID19 would impact data (based on 2019-2020 data), was unusually low compared to previous years (and thus believed to be an anomaly) which is why the stakeholders chose FFY 2019 (the most recent pre-COVID19 year) as the baseline. Stakeholder input, which included various state and LEA demographics, centered around:

1. The impact of COVID19 - LEAs need time to recover from COVID19 closures, continued illnesses, and providing consistent services in a safe environment. COVID19 caused an increase in substitute teachers, turnover in staff, and absences due to student and family illnesses.
2. Students not attending resulting in LEAs recording students as dropouts following state regulations.
3. Some LEAs face difficulty locating and re-enrolling students that do not return.
4. Students may sign up for virtual learning, don't log on to classes, and then get dropped from enrollment.

An end target of 10.7% was chosen as stakeholders believed this provided adequate rigor while decreasing SD dropout rates. Stakeholders are aware SEP must increase outcomes over the next five years. The greatest increase in targets will come in years five and six giving LEAs time to recover and stabilize from COVID19.

Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator

Option 1

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	610
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	0
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	0
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	52
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	147

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
147	809	2.55%	19.35%	18.17%	Met target	N/A

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth

- 1) Was enrolled in school at some time during the school year;
- 2) Was not enrolled on the last day of school;
- 3) Has not graduated from high school or completed a state approved program;
- 4) Does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: Transfer to another accredited education program, Temporary absence due to suspension or illness, Excused from public school attendance (SDCL 13-27-3), Death
- 5) A student who has moved and is not known to continue in another LEA

Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? (yes/no)

NO

If yes, explain the difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Indicator 2 uses lag year (2019-2020) data. The impact of COVID19 will not be known until 2020-2021 data; LEAs need time to recover from COVID19 closures, continued illnesses may directly impact course credits earned, as well as the continued challenge of providing consistent services within a safe environment. COVID19 caused an increase in substitute teachers, turnover in staff, and absences due to student and family illnesses beginning the fall of 2020.

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

3A. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS185 and 188.

Measurement

A. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in an assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), *i.e.*, a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3A: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates for children with IEPs for each of the following grades: 4, 8, & high school. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in grades 4, 8, and high school, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3A - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	95.52%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	92.13%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	93.28%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	95.20%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	91.50%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	92.97%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	95.52%	95.52%	95.79%	96.10%	96.74%	98.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	92.13%	92.13%	92.19%	92.59%	93.40%	95.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	93.28%	93.28%	93.22%	93.48%	93.99%	95.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	95.20%	95.20%	97.50%	97.60%	97.80%	98.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	91.50%	91.50%	91.94%	92.38%	93.25%	95.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	92.97%	92.97%	93.22%	93.48%	93.99%	95.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The stakeholder group considered participation data in all tested grade levels in both content areas from prior years. Participation data for FFY 2020 was not available during the initial stakeholder meeting and there was no data from FFY 2019 due to an approved federal testing waiver, but stakeholders determined that due to the significant impact COVID19 has had on instruction and due to a waiver from testing in FFY 2019 that the FFY 2020 should be set as the baseline year.

Historically SD has had a high rate of participation in the statewide assessment. The stakeholder group discussed the potential for a significant data drop in FFY 2020 due to the impact of COVID19. The participation rate decreased due to a lower total number of assessments administered and students being tested during the testing window. Many students were also in isolation or quarantined during the testing window due to COVID19. There was no way to ensure a secure platform and environment if the assessment was administered virtually, which would therefore impact the validity of the test, so students who could not be tested in a secure environment were not administered the state assessment. The group discussed the probability of recovering the participation rate back near 99% after five years. There was stakeholder discussion around other historical impacts on data as well, such as changes in the assessment and public concerns about changes to standards which caused parents to refuse their children to participate in statewide assessment. There was discussion around potential causes for lower math participation rates in middle school and high school: apathy, test fatigue, autonomy, attitude toward the assessment, attendance rate, and LEA ability to provide staffing and time for students to make up missed test days.

The stakeholders were aware that a minimum target of 95% was required for participation. The stakeholder group determined based on historic rates of participation and the uncertainty of future participation rates that a target of 98% for the elementary and 95% for middle school and high school across both content areas was rigorous. The group considered different targets for reading and math but determined to keep them the same because participation rates across content areas tend to be consistent.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

03/30/2022

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	1,875	1,372	893
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	1,581	1,074	684
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	110	94	62
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	100	96	87

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

03/30/2022

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	1,876	1,377	896
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	1,510	939	702
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	176	224	45
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	100	97	86

*The children with IEPs count excludes children with disabilities who were reported as exempt due to significant medical emergency in row a for all the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	1,791	1,875		95.52%	95.52%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	1,264	1,372		92.13%	92.13%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	833	893		93.28%	93.28%	N/A	N/A

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	1,786	1,876		95.20%	95.20%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	1,260	1,377		91.50%	91.50%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	833	896		92.97%	92.97%	N/A	N/A

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

<https://sdschools.sd.gov/#/home>

Directions to access report information to fulfill requirements in CFR 300.160(f):

1. Click on the level of data to be analyzed by school, district or state on the lower part of the page, for example, to see state level data click on the state/link/icon.
2. After clicking the level (either state, district, or school), click on student performance.
3. Scroll down to the "performance by student population section".
4. Click the green button called "View Details"
5. Click on "students with disabilities"
6. After step five, a new dialogue option should load with an "Interactive Analysis" window. Click on the "Table" tab located right beside the "Chart" tab at the top of the interactive analysis window.
7. The data can be filtered in multiple ways including by grade level, test type and tested subject. This window fulfills reporting requirements in CFR 300.160(f).
8. This data can be exported by sliding the slide bar at the bottom of the table and selecting the three dots (which will appear by hovering over the top right corner of the table).
9. If you need to see previous years' report cards you need to go to the very right-side top corner and click on the red "Options menu", then within this menu, you have an option to click prior years' report cards.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3A - OSEP Response**3A - Required Actions**

Indicator 3B: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

3B. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

B. Proficiency rate percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards)}}{\text{(total \# of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment)}} \right]$. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3B: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the regular assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3B - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	18.51%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	10.53%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	15.95%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	20.58%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	6.71%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	3.48%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	18.51%	18.51%	19.14%	19.76%	21.01%	23.51%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	10.53%	10.53%	10.91%	11.28%	12.03%	13.53%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	15.95%	15.95%	16.33%	16.70%	17.45%	18.95%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	20.58%	20.58%	21.22%	21.86%	23.15%	25.58%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	6.71%	6.71%	7.09%	7.46%	8.21%	9.71%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	3.48%	3.48%	3.86%	4.23%	4.98%	6.48%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The stakeholder group met to review historical data, statistical trends, and forecast data to determine proficiency targets for grades 4, 8, and HS in reading and math. Although FFY 2020 proficiency data was not yet available during the initial stakeholder meeting, the group considered keeping the baseline year the same. After discussion regarding no data from FFY 2019 due to having an approved federal waiver and COVID19 having a significant impact on participation and proficiency, the stakeholder group determined that the baseline year should be set to FFY 2020.

In determining targets, the stakeholders considered using a target that aligns with ESSA accountability 15-year targets for the special education subgroup as identified in the DOE accountability plan but rejected this because the target is unrealistic based on historical data trends. The stakeholder group discussed the potential for lower proficiency scores in FFY 2020 due to the COVID19 impact. The stakeholders considered the decline in the number of test-takers across grade levels and the possibility that the upper-grade students are students with more significant disabilities. When setting targets, the stakeholders considered that Kindergarteners, who were impacted by COVID19, will be the test-takers in FFY 2025. The stakeholders discussed the number of students needed to meet the various target options and the number of districts that fall into the small, medium, and large

classifications. Based on the data and considerations, the stakeholders determined the end target by increasing the baseline by 5% for each individual grade and all content areas. Upon further review by SEP and with additional stakeholders, a new final target of a 3% increase for grade 8 and HS in reading and math was selected based on data projections.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

03/03/2022

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	1,691	1,168	746
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	300	121	116
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	13	2	3

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

03/03/2022

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	1,686	1,163	747
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	337	76	26
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	10	2	0

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	313	1,691		18.51%	18.51%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	123	1,168		10.53%	10.53%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	119	746		15.95%	15.95%	N/A	N/A

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	347	1,686		20.58%	20.58%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	78	1,163		6.71%	6.71%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	26	747		3.48%	3.48%	N/A	N/A

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

<https://sdschools.sd.gov/#/home>

Directions to access report information to fulfill requirements in CFR 300.160(f):

1. Click on the level of data to be analyzed by school, district or state on the lower part of the page, for example, to see state level data click on the state/link/icon.
2. After clicking the level (either state, district, or school), click on student performance.
3. Scroll down to the "performance by student population section".
4. Click the green button called "View Details"
5. Click on "students with disabilities"
6. After step five, a new dialogue option should load with an "Interactive Analysis" window. Click on the "Table" tab located right beside the "Chart" tab at the top of the interactive analysis window.
7. The data can be filtered in multiple ways including by grade level, test type and tested subject. This window fulfills reporting requirements in CFR 300.160(f).
8. This data can be exported by sliding the slide bar at the bottom of the table and selecting the three dots (which will appear by hovering over the top right corner of the table).
9. If you need to see previous years' report cards you need to go to the very right-side top corner and click on the red "Options menu", then within this menu, you have an option to click prior years' report cards.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3B - OSEP Response

3B - Required Actions

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Alternate Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

3C. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

C. Proficiency rate percent = $[(\# \text{ of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against alternate academic achievement standards}) \div (\text{total } \# \text{ of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment})]$. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3C: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the alternate assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3C - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	38.00%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	33.33%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	56.32%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	54.00%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	39.18%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	56.98%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	38.00%	38.00%	38.63%	39.25%	40.50%	43.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	33.33%	33.33%	33.71%	34.08%	34.83%	36.33%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	56.32%	56.32%	56.70%	57.07%	57.82%	59.32%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	54.00%	54.00%	54.63%	55.25%	56.50%	59.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	39.18%	39.18%	39.56%	39.93%	40.68%	42.18%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	56.98%	56.98%	57.36%	57.73%	58.48%	59.98%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The stakeholder group met to review historical data, statistical trends, and forecast data to determine a proficiency target for students participating in alternate assessment for grades 4, 8, and HS in reading and math. Although FFY 2020 proficiency data was not yet available during the initial stakeholder meeting, the stakeholder group determined that the baseline year should be set to FFY 2020. The stakeholder group considered keeping the baseline year the same, but because there was no data from FFY 2019 due to having an approved federal waiver and COVID19 having a significant impact on participation and proficiency in FFY 2020 the determination was made to reset the baseline. The group discussed the potential for a significant decrease in proficiency on the alternate assessment in FFY 2020 due to COVID19. This subgroup of students has significant medical concerns and are more likely to be receiving services virtually during the pandemic.

Another area of discussion was the reasons for the decline in scores in grade 4 reading. The stakeholders suggested that it may be due to more stringent requirements for participation in the alternate assessment by meeting the significant cognitive disability requirements, or that IEP teams are taking into consideration the impact of participation in the alternate assessment on the potential to graduate with a regular high school diploma. The stakeholders discussed the effects on the alternate assessment proficiency when SD transitioned to the Multi-State Alternate Assessment (MSAA). When IEP teams implemented the revised participation requirements for students to take the MSAA, scores decreased. The state provided additional training in 2018-2019 on the criteria and there was a shift in students that were performing at a higher proficiency rate on the MSAA being reconsidered for the general assessment with accommodations, thus prompting a decrease in proficiency scores.

The stakeholders discussed the pros and cons of each proposed target as well as other targets suggested by the stakeholders. The stakeholders discussed the minimal number of LEAs and students included in this indicator. Ultimately the stakeholders decided on a 5% increase from the baseline to the target goal for all grades and all content areas. Upon further review by SEP and with additional stakeholders, a new final target of a 3% increase for grade 8 and HS in reading and math was selected based on data projections.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

03/03/2022

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	100	96	87
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	38	32	49

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

03/03/2022

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	100	97	86
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	54	38	49

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	38	100		38.00%	38.00%	N/A	N/A

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
B	Grade 8	32	96		33.33%	33.33%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	49	87		56.32%	56.32%	N/A	N/A

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	54	100		54.00%	54.00%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	38	97		39.18%	39.18%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	49	86		56.98%	56.98%	N/A	N/A

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

<https://sdschools.sd.gov/#/home>

Directions to access report information to fulfill requirements in CFR 300.160(f):

1. Click on the level of data to be analyzed by school, district or state on the lower part of the page, for example, to see state level data click on the state/link/icon.
2. After clicking the level (either state, district, or school), click on student performance.
3. Scroll down to the "performance by student population section".
4. Click the green button called "View Details"
5. Click on "students with disabilities"
6. After step five, a new dialogue option should load with an "Interactive Analysis" window. Click on the "Table" tab located right beside the "Chart" tab at the top of the interactive analysis window.
7. The data can be filtered in multiple ways including by grade level, test type and tested subject. This window fulfills reporting requirements in CFR 300.160(f).
8. This data can be exported by sliding the slide bar at the bottom of the table and selecting the three dots (which will appear by hovering over the top right corner of the table).
9. If you need to see previous years' report cards you need to go to the very right-side top corner and click on the red "Options menu", then within this menu, you have an option to click prior years' report cards.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3C - OSEP Response

3C - Required Actions

Indicator 3D: Gap in Proficiency Rates (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

3D. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

D. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes all children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), *i.e.*, a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3D: Gap calculations in this SPP/APR must result in the proficiency rate for children with IEPs were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year. Calculate separately for reading/language arts and math in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3D - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	29.79
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	41.45
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	49.97
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	26.51
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	32.88
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	35.80

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A <=	Grade 4	29.79	29.79	29.54	29.29	28.79	27.79
Reading	B <=	Grade 8	41.45	41.45	41.14	40.83	40.20	38.95
Reading	C <=	Grade HS	49.97	49.97	49.66	49.35	48.72	47.47
Math	A <=	Grade 4	26.51	26.51	26.26	26.01	25.51	24.51
Math	B <=	Grade 8	32.88	32.88	32.57	32.26	31.63	30.38
Math	C <=	Grade HS	35.80	35.80	35.49	35.18	34.55	33.30

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The stakeholder group met to review historical data, statistical trends and forecast data to determine a target goal for gap percentage in grades 4, 8, and HS. Although FFY 2020 proficiency data was not yet available during the initial stakeholder meeting, the stakeholder group determined that the baseline year should be set to FFY 2020. The stakeholder group considered keeping the baseline year the same, but because there was no data from FFY 2019 due to having an approved federal waiver and COVID19 having a significant impact on participation and proficiency in FFY 2020 the determination was made to reset the baseline.

In considering target setting, the stakeholder group considered the impact of increased achievement levels for all students, including students in general

education as well as special education. If the proficiency rate for either group were to increase or decrease while the other stays consistent (due to the circumstances listed below), the gap percentage would see a significant impact. Another point discussed by the stakeholders was based around the LEAs that had a gap rate over 30% and whether their percentage was reflective of a small N size. The stakeholders discussed the increasing rigor of the statewide assessment and the potential for the gap to become greater between proficiency levels of general education students and students on IEPs. The stakeholders also considered a potential change in gap in the FFY 2020 data due to COVID19 impacts.

The stakeholders looked at historical data for all students as well as students with disabilities and reviewed targets set for 3B to determine what the gap has been historically and how that may impact the proposed targets. Utilizing that data, the stakeholders discovered the gap had been averaging around 28% for the elementary level and much higher for the middle school and high school levels at 40%. The stakeholders decided on a 2% decrease from the baseline for grades and content areas that were under 30%, and a 2.5% decrease for grades and content areas over a 30% baseline in order to set final targets.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

03/03/2022

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	9,817	10,184	8,557
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	1,691	1,168	746
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	4,726	5,289	5,637
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	16	5	4
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	300	121	116
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	13	2	3

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

03/03/2022

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	9,814	10,182	8,544
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	1,686	1,163	747
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	4,611	4,029	3,356
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	11	2	0
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	337	76	26
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	10	2	0

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	18.51%	48.30%		29.79	29.79	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	10.53%	51.98%		41.45	41.45	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	15.95%	65.92%		49.97	49.97	N/A	N/A

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	20.58%	47.10%		26.51	26.51	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	6.71%	39.59%		32.88	32.88	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	3.48%	39.28%		35.80	35.80	N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3D - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3D - OSEP Response
3D - Required Actions

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2019-2020 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2019-2020 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2020-2021, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2019-2020 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2019-2020 (which can be found in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts that met the minimum n and/or cell size requirement, if applicable). If significant discrepancies occurred, describe how the State educational agency reviewed and, if appropriate, revised (or required the affected local educational agency to revise) its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices comply with applicable requirements.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

4A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2016	0.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target <=	1.30%	33.33%	33.33%	33.33%	0.00%
Data	0.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The stakeholder groups considered revising the target, but determined it should remain at 0.00% because there has been no significant change in measurement or practices with baseline data. The only consideration to show improvement over baseline is to set target at 0%. Based on N size SD has only had between one and three LEAs that meet the N size that have suspended students for greater than 10 days, the previous target of 33.33% allowed for one LEA to be found to have significant discrepancies for suspension. The current target of 0.00% is the only numerical option to reflect improvement over the baseline.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n/cell-size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met the State-established n/cell size. Report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

148

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell size	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
0	1	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Choose one of the following comparison methodologies to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring (34 CFR §300.170(a))

Compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

SD defines significant discrepancy as more than 5% of the unduplicated students with disabilities at the LEA level with 10 or more students included in the numerator and the LEA child count included in the denominator. SD chose this option for analyzing suspension data because the DOE does not collect data on suspensions of students who are not on IEPs in a format that allows a comparison between the two groups.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Because Indicator 4A uses lag year (2019-2020) data, this data was impacted by COVID19, because during this time frame instruction shifted to a virtual environment due to COVID19.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2020 using 2019-2020 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

21 LEAs reported suspending one or more students for greater than ten days. Of the 21 LEAs, one met the minimum N size of 10 students for removals, no LEAs suspended over 5% of their special education students for greater than 10 days and therefore no LEAs were required to have a review of policies, procedures, and practices.

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4A - OSEP Response

4A - Required Actions

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of LEAs totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2019-2020 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2019-2020 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2020-2021, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2019-2020 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2019-2020 (which can be found in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of LEAs that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those LEAs in which policies, procedures or practices contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

4B - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2016	0.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n/cell-size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met the State-established n/cell size. Report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

148

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those LEAs that have policies, procedure or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell size	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	1	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

SD defines significant discrepancy as more than 5% of the unduplicated students with disabilities at the LEA level with 10 or more students included in the numerator and the LEA child count included in the denominator. SD chose this option for analyzing suspension data because the DOE does not collect data on suspensions of students who are not on IEPs in a format that allows a comparison between the two groups.

IEP students per race and ethnic group suspended or expelled at the LEA > than 10 days in a school year ÷ Child Count at the LEA X 100 = %

Significant Discrepancy: If greater than 5% of the LEA child count population by race or ethnicity have been suspended for >10 days.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Because Indicator 4B uses lag year (2019-2020) data, this data was impacted by COVID19. During this time frame instruction shifted to a virtual environment due to COVID19.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2020 using 2019-2020 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

21 LEAs reported suspending one or more students for greater than ten days. Of the 21 LEAs, one met the minimum N size of 10 students for removals none had suspended over 5% of their special education students in any of their race or ethnic groups for greater than 10 days and therefore were not required to have a review of policies, procedures, and practices.

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4B - OSEP Response

4B- Required Actions

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 5 (Kindergarten) - 21)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served:

- A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
- B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and
- C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS002.

Measurement

- A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs are included in Indicator 6. Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	2020	Target >=	67.00%	67.00%	67.50%	68.00%	68.00%
A	75.96%	Data	69.21%	70.40%	71.01%	72.08%	73.91%
B	2020	Target <=	6.00%	6.00%	6.00%	6.00%	6.00%
B	5.57%	Data	5.64%	5.40%	5.46%	5.57%	5.38%
C	2020	Target <=	3.59%	3.49%	3.39%	3.29%	3.29%
C	1.67%	Data	2.20%	2.07%	1.94%	1.99%	1.99%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	75.96%	75.96%	76.68%	77.18%	77.68%	78.68%
Target B <=	5.57%	5.57%	5.57%	5.57%	5.50%	5.50%
Target C <=	1.67%	1.67%	1.67%	1.67%	1.67%	1.65%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Indicator 5A: Stakeholders discussed that SD has a trajectory of growth regarding inclusion. Now, with a majority of 5 years olds who will contribute to the 80% to 100% educational environment, 5A will continue to remain high. There was discussion if COVID19 would impact the percentage and growth and determined it potentially could be seen in FFY 2021. According to the data, middle and high school levels were the lowest areas of students in the 80% to 100% setting so SEP will target this group for professional development. Stakeholders identified SEP improvement strategies should focus on providing professional development related to behaviors, research-based interventions and innovation in supports for students.

Indicator 5 B

Stakeholders reviewed FFY 2020 child count data and analyzed the less than 40% setting, there were 1107 students in this category of those, 885 students have disability categories of cognitive disability, multiple disability and autism spectrum disorder. Students with multiple disabilities had cognitive disability and/or autism spectrum disorder as one of the qualifying areas. The highest percentage age of less than 40% is ages 8, 11 and 14. These ages coincide with transitions academically so between 3rd and 4th grade curriculum moves toward learning basic concepts to applying them. When students move into later elementary grades, academic reading tasks increase across content areas. Students are expected to apply comprehension strategies to a variety of texts in science, social studies, and other school subjects. Students who may not have mastery of basic reading skills find these tasks increasingly challenging and need significant levels of support to complete them. Fifth to sixth grade and eight to ninth grade are also when students transition from elementary to middle school and middle school to high school. When the academic rigor increases, this can also affect student behavior as students struggling to learn and apply the curriculum resulting in moving to a more restrictive environment.

Indicator 5C

Separate Setting: There was 332 students that fit this category. Of the 332 students, multiple disabilities make up 42% of students in this category, followed by cognitive and autism spectrum disorder similar to the less than 40% setting. The majority of the students in this setting are in grades 9 to 12. It appears, as students move up the grade levels and rigor of the general education curriculum increases, it results in removals from the general education environment. Since a majority of LEAs are rural and have a K-12 enrollment with less than 300 students, they have very few 18-21 year olds that require continued special education. IEP teams do consider an outside placement to begin transition phase from school to other supports that are outside the local area.

Indicator 5B and 5C: SD has a very low percentage in both 5B and 5C. Stakeholders felt COVID19 may cause that percentage to remain fairly consistent as LEAs are trying support student health concerns and the additional concerns for students with greater social emotional needs. Stakeholders also felt that SD needs to provide additional training and support around strategies to support universal design and positive behavior interventions and supports related to implementation and data gathering. The targets are very flatlined and only have a final target of .07 decrease for 5B and .02 decrease for 5C.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	19,879
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	15,100
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	1,107
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	142
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	142
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	47

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	15,100	19,879	73.91%	75.96%	75.96%	N/A	N/A
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	1,107	19,879	5.38%	5.57%	5.57%	N/A	N/A
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities,	331	19,879	1.99%	1.67%	1.67%	N/A	N/A

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]							

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

New Baseline:

For the FFY 2020, December 1, 2020 child count data collection, SD implemented the FS002 federal data collection requirement change of 5 year olds in Kindergarten. For FFY 2020 child count, this added 835 students to Indicator 5. Of the 835, 750 were in the 80% to 100%, 38 in the less than 40% environment and 5 students made up the separate setting environment. The 80% to 100% setting will be impacted the most by including 5 year olds. SEP did analyze, if 5 year olds were not added, would it impact 5A, 5B, and 5C. All three areas would have continued to follow the trajectory with very small percentage change of less than 1 percent for all areas.

COVID19 Impact: In FFY 2020, LEAs were offering services to students virtually, in-person and hybrid models. Due to large flexibilities, in FFY 2020, data did not indicate a noticeable impact.

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 3, 4, and aged 5 who are enrolled in a preschool program attending a:

- A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
- B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.
- C. Receiving special education and related services in the home.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS089.

Measurement

- A. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program)}}{\text{(total \# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)}} \times 100 \right]$
- B. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility)}}{\text{(total \# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)}} \times 100 \right]$
- C. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs receiving special education and related services in the home)}}{\text{(total \# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)}} \times 100 \right]$

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten are included in Indicator 5.

States may choose to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age.

For Indicator 6C: States are not required to establish a baseline or targets if the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home is less than 10, regardless of whether the State chooses to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age. In a reporting period during which the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home reaches 10 or greater, States are required to develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

For Indicator 6C: States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%). Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under IDEA section 618, explain.

6 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data – 6A, 6B

Part	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	Target >=	21.45%	21.45%	21.55%	21.65%	21.65%
A	Data	22.38%	24.02%	24.24%	23.33%	23.79%
B	Target <=	16.26%	16.26%	16.16%	16.16%	16.16%
B	Data	13.74%	13.72%	14.45%	14.85%	13.62%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

FFY 2020 was chosen as the baseline year because FFY 2020 Child Count data excluded students age 5 who are in Kindergarten. Moving forward to meet inclusive yearly targets, FFY 2020 is the most current, accurate data. Stakeholder's in-depth conversation to improve Indicator 6 centered around the data, challenges faced in the field, steps SEP can take to assist LEAs, and the unknown effects of COVID19. Stakeholders discussed the lack of access students have to regular early childhood programs and the opportunity for LEA staff to provide special education and related services in a private preschool setting or daycare. Stakeholders also conversed about the hesitancy daycare providers and private preschools have in regard to LEA personnel being allowed to enter the private sector and provide special education and related services within the private setting. Stakeholders believe this challenge could be addressed through the collaboration of SEP and the Department of Social Services, Child Care Services (DSS CCS) providing training and education through the Early Childhood Enrichment (ECE) program. The ECE program provides a variety of services to include research-based professional development opportunities in the area of child growth and development and learning environments and curriculum. SEP could also provide professional development to help LEAs understand the placement within the early childhood continuum and options for modifying the placement to meet the student's needs.

Stakeholders reviewed historical, trend, and forecast data from a statewide perspective and compared this with the national data. The group also analyzed the LEAs impacted with low percentages in 6A and high percentages in 6B and the raw number of students in each placement versus the percentage. Stakeholders believe the new targets are rigorous but still obtainable given the uncertainty of COVID19 and the lack of early childhood settings available in a rural state such as SD.

6A: Location of services was discussed at length. Discussion included the implication of the LRE and the ruralness of SD. Due to the sparsity of the population in rural areas, LEAs have difficulty providing access to a preschool setting where non-IEP students are being educated. Regular education preschools are funded by the LEA not state level funding. Stakeholders also discussed the challenge LEAs have with resources (staffing and availability of rooms/space) to have a regular early childhood program. The removal of students age 5 and in kindergarten was also analyzed since this change made a substantial difference in the number of students serviced in 6A. In FFY 2020 the number of students serviced in 6A was 410. In FFY 2019 the number of students serviced in 6A was 723, a difference of 311 students. Stakeholders believe the largest difference stems from students advancing to kindergarten; however, some students could have moved out of state or exited the Part B 619 program. Stakeholders deemed the removal of students age 5 and in kindergarten from Indicator 6 to have a negative impact on the data.

Stakeholders considered the placement categories for the LRE and determined there is confusion in the wording when IEP teams are selecting the placement category relevant to 6A data. The categories are: 0310 "10 hours or more per week" and 0325 "less than 10 hours per week" on the Continuum of Alternative Placements (Preschool Ages 3-5). When selecting the placement for a student, stakeholders believe LEAs were confused as to whether services were provided for 10 or more hours per week or if the student attended a regular early childhood program 10 or more hours per week. This confusion has been addressed through rewording the continuum of alternative placement on the SEP IEP document. To clarify 6A - 0310 now reads: Regular Early Childhood Program 10 or more hours per week and SPED services in Regular EC program. 6A - 0325 now reads: Regular Early Childhood Program Less than 10 hours per week and SPED services in Reg EC program. SEP has also addressed the confusion through Early Childhood workshops conducted in the fall and provided an in-depth virtual training on Indicator 6 LRE. Stakeholders believe the clarification will help increase the IEP team making the correct placement choice, thereby improving the data.

6B: SD has a very low percentage of students in 6B. Stakeholders discussed the LEAs with Special Education Classes or Separate Schools and the fact that students with high needs are serviced in these environments. Stakeholders reviewed the data within the LEAs indicating students on IEPs are being identified with higher needs. Conversation centered around strategies to increase the time students on IEPs are educated with non-IEP students attending a daycare, private preschool, Head Start or public preschool when available. Stakeholders also discussed LEA staff gaining knowledge through LEA professional development on inclusion in the early childhood program.

6C: SD has a very low percentage in 6C. With only 24 students being serviced in the home in FFY 2020 and only 25 students serviced in the home in FFY 2019, stakeholders were challenged with ensuring this percentage does not increase. Challenges presented in keeping this a low percentage could be contributed to COVID19 and parents who want their student to be serviced in the home due to health issues.

Stakeholders determined COVID19 is still a concern regarding the impact it may have in the next few years of data and the lingering effects in the distant future, which are unknown at this time. Stakeholders indicated challenges may occur due to parents being afraid to allow their student to attend a regular early childhood program due to fear of COVID19, especially those who are medically fragile.

Targets

Please select if the State wants to set baseline and targets based on individual age ranges (i.e. separate baseline and targets for each age), or inclusive of all children ages 3, 4, and 5.

Inclusive Targets

Please select if the State wants to use target ranges for 6C.

Target Range not used

Baselines for Inclusive Targets option (A, B, C)

Part	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
A	2020	21.76%
B	2020	18.15%
C	2020	1.27%

Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	21.76%	22.00%	22.75%	23.50%	24.25%	25.00%
Target B <=	18.15%	17.93%	17.60%	17.17%	16.74%	16.00%

Inclusive Targets – 6C

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target C <=	1.67%	1.27%	1.26%	1.24%	1.22%	1.20%

Prepopulated Data

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

Date:

07/07/2021

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
Total number of children with IEPs	543	969	372	1,884
a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	104	248	58	410
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	125	148	55	328
b2. Number of children attending separate school	7	6	1	14
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0	0	0	0
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	9	9	6	24

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data - Aged 3 through 5

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	410	1,884	23.79%	21.76%	21.76%	N/A	N/A
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	342	1,884	13.62%	18.15%	18.15%	N/A	N/A
C. Home	24	1,884		1.67%	1.27%	N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

- a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

Summary Statement 1: Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 1: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d)) divided by (# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d))] times 100.

Summary Statement 2: The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 2: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (e)) divided by (the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of **children for assessment** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

In the measurement include, in the numerator and denominator, only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements. States have provided targets for the two Summary Statements for the three Outcomes (six numbers for targets for each FFY).

Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three outcomes.

In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers." If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS), then the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.

In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS.

7 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A1	2018	Target >=	79.15%	79.15%	79.25%	79.35%	79.35%
A1	67.11%	Data	75.86%	71.65%	70.00%	67.11%	67.74%
A2	2018	Target >=	84.15%	84.15%	84.25%	84.35%	84.35%

A2	71.79%	Data	84.62%	81.95%	80.64%	71.79%	73.43%
B1	2018	Target >=	66.50%	67.50%	68.50%	69.50%	69.50%
B1	56.71%	Data	66.85%	67.97%	62.41%	56.71%	57.74%
B2	2018	Target >=	55.96%	55.96%	56.96%	57.96%	57.96%
B2	51.89%	Data	56.28%	59.39%	56.87%	51.89%	47.74%
C1	2018	Target >=	69.10%	70.10%	71.10%	71.60%	71.60%
C1	58.35%	Data	69.83%	68.97%	61.49%	58.35%	60.06%
C2	2018	Target >=	72.10%	72.10%	72.60%	73.60%	73.60%
C2	66.13%	Data	73.46%	72.80%	71.14%	66.13%	66.72%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A1 >=	67.11%	67.11%	67.35%	67.58%	68.06%	69.00%
Target A2 >=	71.79%	71.79%	72.07%	72.34%	72.90%	74.00%
Target B1 >=	56.71%	56.71%	57.12%	57.53%	58.36%	60.00%
Target B2 >=	51.89%	51.89%	52.15%	52.42%	52.95%	54.00%
Target C1 >=	58.35%	58.35%	58.81%	59.26%	60.17%	62.00%
Target C2 >=	66.13%	66.13%	66.36%	66.60%	67.07%	68.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

FFY 2018 was chosen as the baseline year for Indicator 7 A1, A2, B1, B2, C1 and C2. Stakeholders chose the same year for all outcomes of Indicator 7 as it proved to be following the linear trend, which has been historically decreasing. Stakeholders are aware LEAs must increase outcomes over the next five years. The ongoing effects of COVID19, the implementation of the Battelle Developmental Inventory 3rd Edition (BDI-3), SD's large rural areas, and limited public preschools available to all students age 3-5, prompted the stakeholders to be cautious in selecting the baseline year and targets. The greatest increase in targets will come in the last three to five years to allow time for LEAs to recover and stabilize from COVID19.

Stakeholder input, which included various state and LEA demographics, centered around:

1. The impact of COVID19 - LEAs need time to recover from COVID19 closures, continued illnesses, and providing consistent services in a safe environment. COVID19 caused an increase in substitute teachers, which does not promote consistency in reaching student goals and objectives, turnover in staff, and absences due to child and family illnesses.
2. SD LEAs are required to fund their own public preschools versus state level funding being provided for LEA public preschools (Indicator 6 Least Restrictive Environment for students age 3-5 not in Kindergarten) - students not afforded the opportunity to receive services along side their non-disabled peers because not all LEAs have public preschools. Preschools also help LEAs' service providers to work together instead of being compartmentalized providing an environment for more collaboration between service providers and family members. The early childhood setting/preschool also provides the opportunity for IEP services to include daily routines/activities within the educational setting. The importance of LEAs implementing curriculum that is research-based and provides continuous progress monitoring to reach goals and improve outcomes was also discussed.
3. The implementation of the Battelle Developmental Inventory 3rd Edition (BDI-3) - SD implemented the BDI-3 on July 1, 2021 for all new evaluations. LEAs will have until December 31, 2024 to ensure all students' outcomes (entry and exit scores) are being monitored using the BDI-3. Merging of the Battelle Developmental Inventory 2nd Edition (BDI-2) and BDI-3 scores may impact Indicator 7 data and this was a concern noted by stakeholders.
4. Students on an IEP with significant needs - LEAs reported more students with multiple disabilities and high level autism impacting the progress growth for these students due to ability.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

865

Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	0	0.00%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	122	14.10%

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Children
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	117	13.53%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	168	19.42%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	458	52.95%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	285	407	67.74%	67.11%	70.02%	Met target	No Slippage
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	626	865	73.43%	71.79%	72.37%	Met target	No Slippage

Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication)

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	0	0.00%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	270	31.21%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	161	18.61%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	184	21.27%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	250	28.90%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	345	615	57.74%	56.71%	56.10%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	434	865	47.74%	51.89%	50.17%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	0	0.00%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	180	20.81%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	135	15.61%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	144	16.65%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	406	46.94%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	279	459	60.06%	58.35%	60.78%	Met target	No Slippage
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	550	865	66.72%	66.13%	63.58%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
B1	<p>LEAs have continuously struggled to meet targets from the previous 6 years and this year has proven to follow the trend. LEAs have reported an increase in students with substantial needs versus, for example, speech only students entering the Part B 619 program. The severity of the disability contributes to students not making substantial gains when exiting the Part B 619 program. In regards to acquisition and use of knowledge and skills, it is unclear if students are being instructed with curriculum that is research-based thereby promoting progress in cognitive and communication skills. During Stakeholder discussion and reviewing the data it was determined 4 additional students would have to substantially increase their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program (6B1) in order for the target to be met. Although 4 students seems minimal, in a rural state such as SD 4 students are the difference of several percentage points.</p> <p>Stakeholders were conscientious of the impact of COVID19 when setting the new targets and the burden COVID19 has placed on the LEAs and family members. Due to COVID19, LEAs have struggled to keep doors open and staff members healthy while providing a clean and safe environment for students. Indicator 7B1 requires a substantial increase in the student's rate of growth by the time the student turns 6 years of age or exits the program, therefore, inconsistent staffing due to illness, family/student illness, and periodic/short-term closure of LEAs for deep cleaning contributes to the state not meeting the target and the identified slippage.</p>
C2	<p>Students with severe needs/multiple disabilities develop at a slower rate and do not reach the adaptive and motor developmental milestones as typically developing peers not on IEPs. When LEAs do not have a preschool program to implement bathroom and self-care routines along with structured motor activities, students with disabilities are not able to learn from or follow the skills of their typically developing peers not on IEPs. During Stakeholder discussion and reviewing the data it was determined 22 additional students would need to be functioning within age expectations by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program (6C2) in order for the target to be met. As stated above, a small number such as 22 does not seem significant, however, 22 students in a rural state such as SD are a difference of several percentage points.</p> <p>As stated above in B1 COVID19 contributed to the state not meeting the target and slippage occurring. Due to COVID19, LEAs have struggled to keep doors open and staff members healthy while providing a clean and safe environment for students. Indicator 7C2 requires students to be functioning within age expectation by the time they turn 6 or exit the program in adaptive and motor skills, therefore, inconsistent staffing due to illness, family/student illness, and periodic/short-term closure of LEAs for deep cleaning contributes to the state not meeting the target and the identified slippage.</p>

Does the State include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years? (yes/no)

YES

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COS) process? (yes/no)

NO

If no, provide the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers.”

SD defined "comparable to same-age peers" as any student who received a standard score of -1.27 or above the norm on the Battelle Developmental Inventory II (BDI-2) scoring chart. This corresponds to the 10th percentile rank on the BDI-2 for a given outcome area.

List the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.

The Battelle Developmental Inventory 2 (BDI-2) is used to gather data for this indicator. When a student exits the Part C program and transitions to Part B (619), the student is assessed in the areas of cognitive, physical, communication, social-emotional, and adaptive development using the BDI-2. The exit data for Part C becomes the baseline data for students who become eligible for Part B (619). Students who enter the Part B (619) system at or after age three, will be re-evaluated using the BDI-2 in the areas of the development listed previously to establish a baseline. Upon exiting the 619 program (student exits early or turns 6), a student is assessed in the same five areas of development using the BDI-2. The baseline entry scores will be compared to the exit scores in the five evaluated areas of development to determine progress in the three indicator outcome areas.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

FFY 2018 was chosen as the baseline year for Indicator 7 A1, A2, B1, B2, C1 and C2 because FFY 2018 proved to follow the linear trend which has been historically decreasing and the data was not influenced by the instability that may occur due to COVID19. FFY 2018 the percentages dropped in all outcomes except B2 which showed a slight increase in the percentage. FFY 2019 showed an increase in the percentages except B2 which showed a decrease.

For FFY 2021 Indicator 7 data will be generated from both the BDI-2 and BDI-3 exit results to compile data for reporting. When SD completes the transition from the BDI-2 to the BDI-3 in FFY 2024, stakeholders will need to determine whether or not new baselines and targets need to be established.

COVID19 Impact - LEAs were advised to use the words "COVID19 No Exit Scores" within the BDI-2 Data Manager system when a Part B Exit evaluation could not be completed due to COVID19. After July 1, 2020 LEAs were able to complete a higher number of Part B Exit evaluations, however, 95 students did not receive a Part B Exit evaluation due to COVID19 closures. Uncompleted exit evaluations would have a negative impact on FFY 2020 Indicator 7 data overall.

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

7 - OSEP Response

7 - Required Actions

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of parents from whom response is requested is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

If the State is using a separate data collection methodology for preschool children, the State must provide separate baseline data, targets, and actual target data or discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool data collection methodologies in a manner that is valid and reliable.

While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its SPP/APR.

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed and the number of respondent parents. The survey response rate is automatically calculated using the submitted data.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2020 response rate to the FFY 2019 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.

Include in the State's analysis the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States should consider categories such as race/ethnicity, age of student, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the children for whom parents responding are not representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to parents (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person through school personnel), and how responses were collected.

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, when reporting the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their OSEP-funded parent centers in collecting data.

8 - Indicator Data

Question	Yes / No
Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?	NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

A stakeholder group reviewed historical data on response rate, parent involvement, and the number of districts that are meeting current targets in order to establish a baseline and propose a new target. The group considered impact on scores related to the new survey in previous years, the addition of an online survey option, and the addition of a Spanish version of the parent survey. There was consideration among the group for a higher target due to consistently exceeding the state target over time, which led to the stakeholder group agreeing on a target of 85 percent.

The stakeholder group discussed what year should be identified as the baseline. In reviewing the survey over the years, it was determined that FFY 2012 was the last time in which there had been a significant change to the survey questions and collection options. The stakeholders considered whether COVID19 had any significant impact on the survey, it was determined that there may be an impact on response rate and overall satisfaction, but the COVID19 impact did not justify selecting FFY 2020 as the baseline. It was determined that FFY 2012 would be the most appropriate year to establish baseline data.

Stakeholders discussed providing technical assistance to parents on the purpose of the survey and intent of the questions, such as what meaningful parent participation means. It was also discussed that SEP should provide technical assistance to districts on increasing response rates and activities to incorporate into practices to improve parent understanding and response rate.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2012	77.30%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	77.50%	78.00%	78.50%	79.00%	79.00%
Data	84.35%	84.74%	88.41%	87.77%	87.74%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	81.00%	81.00%	81.50%	82.00%	83.00%	85.00%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
4,790	5,557	87.74%	81.00%	86.20%	Met target	No Slippage

Since the State did not report preschool children separately, discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool surveys in a manner that is valid and reliable.

Parents of all students with disabilities ages 3-21 are provided with a variety of ways to complete the survey. As in previous years, in FFY 2020 the survey was distributed by the LEAs in person, via mail, and an online link. LEAs utilized a variety of approaches to facilitate the completion of the survey including offering time at the annual IEP meeting, parent-teacher conferences, and community dinners. SDPC will also work with parents to complete the survey if there are barriers due to language, reading ability, etc. This personalized distribution method ensured all parents had an opportunity to complete the survey; furthermore, school staff members personally encourage parents to complete the survey.

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

21,763

Percentage of respondent parents

25.53%

Response Rate

FFY	2019	2020
Response Rate	30.00%	25.53%

Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The 2020-2021 response rate is 25.53%. This is slightly lower than the 30.00% response rate in 2019-2020. Altered instruction in some districts at the beginning of the 2020-2021 school year due to COVID19 may have impacted the percentage of parents that completed a survey. The parent involvement percentage decreased 1.54 percentage points from 87.74% in 2019-2020 to 86.20% in 2020-2021. The survey was available online at all times and information was communicated to families. Due to COVID19, family priorities were focused on other areas and therefore a reduced response rate was anticipated.

SEP has implemented various strategies to increase the response rate for each LEA, including but not limited to: LEA training and communication, educating parents through SDPC, and establishing plans for improvement with LEAs that have a return rate of 10% or below.

Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.

Nonresponse bias measures the differences in opinions between respondents and non-respondents in meaningful ways, such as the positivity of responses. A few things can be examined to determine nonresponse bias. One is the overall response rate. The higher the response rate, the less likely nonresponse bias will occur. SD's response rate is 25.53%, which is fairly high.

Second, the representativeness of the responses can be examined. SEP describes this in the next question where it is stated: SEP used statistical significance testing to determine if one group was over- or under-represented based on their response rate. Although significant differences were found in response rates by disability, race/ethnicity, and grade level of the student, the actual responses of these different groups of parents showed no or only small differences in the overall parent involvement percentage. Further, parents from a wide variety of districts from across the state responded to the survey.

Third, a comparison can be made with the responses of parents who responded early in the process to those who responded later in the process. The idea being that perhaps those who do not immediately respond are different in some meaningful way than those who respond immediately. These results showed no statistically significant differences between parents who responded earlier and parents who responded later. Therefore, it was concluded that nonresponse bias is not present.

Include in the State's analysis the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States should consider categories such as race/ethnicity, age of student, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

SEP used statistical significance testing of response rates to determine if one group was over- or under-represented. Note that the survey sample was such that if all disaggregated groups have the same response rate, then by definition, the disaggregated groups are representative of the population. For example, if all racial/ethnic groups had a 30% response rate, then the population of the respondents would mirror the actual population in terms of its racial/ethnic make-up. On the other hand, if one racial/ethnic group has a 30% response rate for example and another a 20% response rate, then the population of the respondents would not mirror the actual population in terms of its racial/ethnic make-up. Significant differences were found in response rates by race/ethnicity, disability, and grade of the child. In terms of race/ethnicity, parents of white students were more likely to respond (response rate=28%) than parents of Hispanic students (response rate=16%) and parents of Native American students (response rate=19%). In terms of disability, parents of students with a Speech/Language Impairment were more likely to respond (response rate=29%) than parents of students with Other Health Impairments (response rate=18%). In terms of grade level, parents of students in preschool were slightly more likely to respond (response rate=29%) than parents of students in grades 6-8 (response rate=24%).

Although there are a few significant differences in response rates between groups of parents by race/ethnicity there were no significant differences in the parent involvement percentage itself between parents of different races/ethnicities. For example, parents of white students had a similar parent involvement percentage as parents of Hispanic students and parents of Native American students. Additionally, while there were differences in the response rates between groups of parents by disability, these subgroups represent a relatively small percentage of parents who responded. Additionally, every district is surveyed every year which is the best way to get an overall parent involvement percent that is representative of the state as a whole. Since parents from a wide range of districts from across the state responded to the survey, SEP concluded that results are representative of all racial/ethnic groups, all disability categories, and all grades and reflect the population of parents in terms of geographic distribution.

The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. (yes/no)

NO

If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

SEP plans to incorporate the following strategies to increase the response rate of parents of Hispanic and Native American students, parents of middle school students, and parents of students with OHI.

- Add a QR code to the cover letter for ease of access.
- Provide technical assistance to districts on ways to provide the survey electronically, such as sending the online survey link via email or text message (this would require phone numbers and emails of parents which districts have access to in the student management system).
- Ask districts with a high response rate for strategies that have been effective, especially those with higher participation rates among Hispanic and Native American populations. These strategies will be provided as technical assistance statewide.
- Reach out to districts with low response rates (under 10%) to discuss strategies and develop a plan to raise their response rates.

Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

Statistical significance testing of response rate was used to determine representativeness with a threshold of $p < 0.05$.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO
If yes, provide a copy of the survey.	

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

8 - OSEP Response

8 - Required Actions

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2020 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2021).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

113

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	36	0.00%	0%	0.00%	N/A	N/A

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

Define "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

SD collects data for Indicator 9 through the December 1 child count and Fall Enrollment collected on the last Friday in September. A Weighted Risk Ratio based on the identification rate for each racial/ethnic group at each LEA is calculated; thus, all data for all racial/ethnic groups in the state are examined. A Weighted Risk Ratio is determined only if there are 20 or more students in the cell size of interest (based on child count data) and if there are also 20 or more students in the comparison group. SD uses one year of data in the calculation.

Disproportionate representation is defined as a Weighted Risk Ratio of 3.00 and above (over-representation). Once a ratio is flagged for numerical disproportionate representation, the policies and procedures of that LEA are reviewed to determine if the disproportionate representation is due to inappropriate identification. For Indicator 9, all of SD's 149 LEAs are included in the analyses. Of these 149 LEAs, 36 met the minimum n requirements at least one time for a Final Risk Ratio to be calculated (for each LEA, in theory, seven risk ratios could be calculated—one for each racial/ethnic group). Please note that many LEAs in SD have fewer than ten students with a disability of a particular race/ethnicity. Thus, very small numbers prevent SEP from calculating reliable and meaningful risk ratios for every racial/ethnic group in every LEA.

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

When an LEA meets the methodology for disproportionate representation, SEP conducts a review. The LEA will provide special education files across disability categories based on race/ethnicity. The SEP team reviews the LEA's identification policy and procedures. The SEP team compares these to documented practices for all students identified with a disability, students in specific categories, and students in identified race/ethnic categories. If the LEA followed appropriate policy and procedures for disability categories and race/ethnicity groups, the LEA is identified as having appropriate identification procedures. If policy and procedures were not appropriately followed, then the LEA would receive a CAP.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Stakeholders discussed historically only one LEA has been numerically identified in race/ethnic group of American Indian or Alaska Native. The group discussed SEP considering aligning Indicator 9 methodology with SEP's significant disproportionality methodology. SEP will analyze the impact of that change in the next year. SEP is working on an updated disproportionality protocol that LEAs could use as a self-assessment.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

9 - OSEP Response

9 - Required Actions

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2020, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2020 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2021).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA. Provide these data at a minimum for children in the following six disability categories: intellectual disability, specific learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, speech or language impairments, other health impairments, and autism. If a State has identified disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories other than these six disability categories, the State must include these data and report on whether the State determined that the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

10 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

132

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	17	0.00%	0%	0.00%	N/A	N/A

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

Define "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

SD collects data for Indicator 10 through the December 1 child count and Fall Enrollment collected on the last Friday in September. A Weighted Risk Ratio based on the identification rate for each racial/ethnic group at each LEA is calculated; thus, all data for all racial/ethnic groups in the state are examined. A Weighted Risk Ratio is determined only if there are 20 or more students in the cell size of interest (based on child count data) and if there are also 20 or more students in the comparison group. SD uses one year of data in the calculation. Disproportionate representation is defined as a Weighted Risk Ratio of 3.00 and above (over-representation). Once a ratio is flagged for numerical disproportionate representation, the policies and procedures of that LEA are reviewed to determine if the disproportionate representation is due to inappropriate identification.

For Indicator 10, all of SD's 149 LEAs are included in the analyses. Of these 149 LEAs, 17 met the minimum N requirements at least one time for a Final Risk Ratio to be calculated (for each LEA, in theory, 42 risk ratios could be calculated—one for each racial/ethnic group times the six primary disability categories). Please note that many LEAs in SD have fewer than ten students with a disability of a particular race/ethnicity; when this is disaggregated further by type of primary disability, the numbers get extremely small. Thus, very small numbers prevent SEP from calculating reliable and meaningful risk ratios for every racial/ethnic group in every LEA.

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

When an LEA meets the methodology for disproportionate representation, SEP conducts a review. The LEA will provide special education files across disability categories based on race/ethnicity. The SEP team reviews the LEA's identification policy and procedures. The SEP team compares these to documented practices for all students identified with a disability, students in specific categories, and students in identified race/ethnic categories. If the LEA followed appropriate policy and procedures for disability categories and race/ethnicity groups, the LEA is identified as having appropriate identification. If policy and procedures were not appropriately followed, then the LEA would receive a CAP.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Stakeholders discussed the historical identification for Indicator 10. For the race/ethnic group of American Indian or Alaska Native, the specific learning disability has been the primary identified area. SD has not had inappropriate identification in determining eligibility for students. LEAs have reviewed and updated policy, procedures and practices related to data input, improvements in teacher interventions and IEP team discussions around eligibility categories.

The group discussed if SEP should consider aligning Indicator 10 methodology with SEP's significant disproportionality methodology. SEP will analyze the impact of that change in the next year. SEP is working on an updated disproportionality protocol that LEAs could use as a self-assessment.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

10 - OSEP Response

10 - Required Actions

Indicator 11: Child Find

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Compliance indicator: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Indicate if the State has established a timeline and, if so, what is the State's timeline for initial evaluations.

Measurement

- a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
 - b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).
- Account for children included in (a), but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Note that under 34 CFR §300.301(d), the timeframe set for initial evaluation does not apply to a public agency if: (1) the parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation; or (2) a child enrolls in a school of another public agency after the timeframe for initial evaluations has begun, and prior to a determination by the child's previous public agency as to whether the child is a child with a disability. States should not report these exceptions in either the numerator (b) or denominator (a). If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in b.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

11 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	99.86%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.85%	99.69%	99.89%	99.94%	99.85%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
5,413	5,395	99.85%	100%	99.67%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Number of children included in (a) but not included in (b)

18

Account for children included in (a) but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

SD did not meet 100% compliance, however, SEP showed substantial compliance with 99.67% of students who were evaluated within SEP's established 25-school day timeline. Although 18 evaluations did not meet compliance, this does not indicate a statewide systemic issue considering FFY 2020 is the year most LEAs returned from virtual learning due to COVID19 and resumed in school learning. LEAs were completing more initial evaluations when schools restarted in the fall of 2020 due to parents extending the evaluation timeline from the spring of 2020. Evaluations that were extended until the fall of 2020 placed a substantial burden on LEAs already suffering from staff shortages, new referrals coming in the fall of 2020, three year evaluations due in the fall of 2020 and COVID19 illnesses. LEAs were also working through the logistics of providing a safe environment with a hybrid model of face-to face and virtual learning in FFY 2020. LEA staff had to be cognizant of timelines while honoring parental requests for virtual learning. The unusual circumstances created a hardship for LEAs in meeting the 25-school day timeline.

Fourteen of the 149 LEAs (total of 18 students) did not meet the 100% target. The reason for failure to meet the 25-school day timeline was due to teacher error counting school days, teacher and student illness due to COVID19, and poor scheduling. Only one of the 14 LEAs received a CAP for a second consecutive year. The remaining 13 of the 14 LEAs, found out of compliance, were in compliance in FFY 2019.

Range of days beyond the timeline:

10 evaluations exceeded by 1 day
1 evaluation exceeded by 2 days
1 evaluation exceeded by 3 days
1 evaluation exceeded by 5 days
1 evaluation exceeded by 6 days
1 evaluation exceeded by 7 days
1 evaluation exceeded by 8 days
1 evaluation exceeded by 10 days
1 evaluation exceeded by 16 days

Indicate the evaluation timeline used:

The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted

What is the State's timeline for initial evaluations? If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in (b).

SD has defined the initial evaluation timeline as 25-school days from the date signed permission is received by the LEA, unless alternative timelines are mutually agreed to by the school administration and the parents in accordance with Administrative Rules of South Dakota (ARSD) 24:05:25:03-Preplacement evaluation.

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

SEP created an electronic system that all LEAs are required to utilize to record and annually report initial evaluations conducted in the LEA. LEAs may utilize a state developed spreadsheet located at <https://doe.sd.gov/sped/SPP.aspx> to record initial evaluations of students throughout the school year. All LEAs are required to enter student data directly into the secure electronic system and sign-off by August 1 of the reporting year.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
6	5	0	1

FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

When an LEA misses an evaluation timeline, they are unable to correct the timeline for the student specific file. SEP verified that all 6 student files whose evaluation were not completed within the 25-school day timeline has been evaluated and eligibility determined by requiring the LEA to submit to SEP the student's PPWNs and evaluation report. LEAs are required to provide training to staff on policies and procedures, including how to document Indicator 11 and how to calculate the 25-school day timeline. SEP also verified each LEA cited for noncompliance completed training on the 25-school day timeline by having the LEA submit to SEP a training agenda, sign-in sheet of LEA staff attending the training, and documents of the policies and

procedures used during the training. Each LEA is also expected to submit a timely and accurate report for the following reporting year. SEP verified that five of the six LEAs were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements based upon a review of updated data for FFY 2020 (Prong 2).

SD LEAs began virtual learning on March 16, 2020 due to mandatory COVID19 closures. SEP advised LEAs to seek parental permission to extend the evaluation timeline on initial evaluations in which parental consent had been obtained but the evaluation could not be completed within the 25-school day timeline due to LEAs closures in accordance with ARSD 24:05:25:03 - Preplacement Evaluation. SEP advised LEAs to carefully track any extended evaluation timelines and complete the initial evaluation as expeditiously as possible when schools resumed for FFY 2020. As predicted, SEP had an increase of initial evaluations during the FFY 2020 due to the closures from COVID19 in FFY 2019. When LEAs entered data into the electronic system they were required to explain the reason the timeline was extended from the spring of 2020 to the fall of 2020. LEAs indicated "COVID19 Closure" as the reason timelines were extended during this time period. For students whose parents did not agree to an extension of the timeline and the evaluation was not completed on time, noncompliance was identified and LEAs were required to complete a CAP.

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

As stated above, LEAs who do not meet the evaluation timeline are unable to correct the timeline for individual files for Indicator 11. SEP verified that all 6 student files whose evaluation were not completed within the 25-school day timeline in FFY 2019 has been evaluated and eligibility determined by requiring the LEA to submit to SEP the student's PPWNs and evaluation report. In addition to providing training on policies and procedures related to timelines, the LEA is also required to complete a desk audit, submit quarterly initial evaluation data, and submit a 100% compliant FFY 2020 report (Prong 2). SEP verified all but one LEA completed requirements for the FFY 2019 CAP and has issued a new CAP to the LEA based on findings during FFY 2020 Indicator 11 data submission.

FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

The LEA that did not achieve 100% compliance in FFY 2019 and FFY 2020, received a second year CAP for FFY 2020 that included a review of their policies and procedures, training for all special education staff on the LEA policies and procedures including how to correctly implement the 25-school day timeline, a desk audit to verify noncompliance and evaluations were completed, and to submit quarterly reports (Prong 1). The LEA is required to submit a compliant FFY 2021 report (Prong 2).

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State must clarify in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR whether evaluations were paused until July 1, 2020 or at some other point during the school year covered by FFY 2020.

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

SEP advised all LEAs there would be no pause of evaluation timelines in FFY 2019. If there was concern on meeting timelines, the IEP team should seek permission to extend the timeline in accordance with ARSD 24:05:25:03 - Preplacement Evaluation. If an extension was not received and the timeline was exceeded the individual student file was considered out of compliance.

SEP has addressed FFY 2019 noncompliance in the Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FF 2019 section of the FFY 2020 SPP.

11 - OSEP Response

11 - Required Actions

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

- a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.
- b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.
- c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.
- e. # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.
- f. # of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(c) divided by (a - b - d - e - f)] times 100.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Category f is to be used only by States that have an approved policy for providing parents the option of continuing early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

12 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	100.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.54%	99.77%	97.72%	96.65%	NVR

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	605
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	175

c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	389
d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	1
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	37
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	0

Measure	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	389	392	NVR	100%	99.23%	Did not meet target	N/A

Number of children who served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e, or f

3

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.

Although SD did not meet the 100% compliance, SEP showed substantial compliance with 99.23% of students referred to Part C prior to age three who are found eligible for Part B and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday. Three incidents of noncompliance doesn't indicate a statewide systemic issue. Substantial training efforts have been made to inform LEAs of the policies and procedures necessary to meet the eligibility determination timeline for students turning age three. All three LEAs were in 100% compliance during FFY 2019.

Three of the 149 LEAs (total of 3 students, one per district), did not meet the 100% target. The reason for failure to meet the student's third birthday timeline was due to the evaluation process starting less than 30 calendar days prior to the student's third birthday, staff unaware of timeline for Birth-3 transition students, and the LEA did not notify the correct staff to conduct the transition evaluation.

Range of days beyond timeline:

1 evaluation exceeded by 1 day
1 evaluation exceeded by 4 days
1 evaluation exceeded by 21 days

Attach PDF table (optional)

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

Part C Service Coordinators submit Part C exit data to DOE Part C office. All exit code data are entered into the Part C data system by the Part C Data Manager. LEAs are required to submit transition data into the secured website annually by September 1st. The Part B 619 Coordinator then analyzes the data submitted, verifies all students are accounted for per Part C records, addresses any data quality issues, verifies noncompliance issues, and provides LEAs with technical assistance on correct procedures. LEAs that do not meet the required timeline are contacted and justification is required for students not having an IEP in place by their third birthday to verify noncompliance.

SEP also verifies the data collected from Part C during accountability reviews. The team reviews early childhood files and monitors students referred from Part C to Part B that were determined eligible and to verify the student had an IEP in place by their third birthday.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Although SEP did not meet 100% compliance, SEP did improve from FFY 2019 and 99.23% does not indicate a statewide systemic issue. LEA closures and the health uncertainties that came with COVID19 in FFY 2019 resulted in an increase of LEAs identified out of compliance for Indicator 12 data. If the LEA postponed the transition evaluation due to COVID19 the LEA was held out of compliance for exceeding the timeline. If the parent postponed or declined the transition evaluation, then the LEA was not held out of compliance. SEP provided additional clarification that extensions for exceeding the timeline are not allowed for students transitioning from Part C to Part B. LEAs were required to complete transition evaluations prior to the student's third birthday even though COVID19 may have an effect on the transition evaluation timelines. Due to the lingering effects of COVID19, LEAs were advised to start the transition process a minimum of 3 months prior to the student's third birthday to meet eligibility determinations and IEP development if eligible, prior to the student's third birthday.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
26	26	0	0

FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

When an LEA misses a transition timeline, they are unable to correct the student specific file. However, SEP verified each student did receive an evaluation and eligibility was determined by requiring LEAs to submit to SEP the referral form, PPWN and eligibility documents for each student in which the LEA was issued a CAP.

SEP also verified each LEA cited for noncompliance completed training on the transition timeline and requirement to develop and implement a student's IEP by their third birthday (prong 1) by having the LEA submit to SEP a training agenda, sign-in sheet of LEA staff attending the training, and documents of the policies and procedures used during the training.

In addition to verifying the student specific noncompliance through desk-audits and training (Prong 1), SEP verified each LEA completed the steps outlined in the CAP through electronic submission of the FFY 2020 data via the secure state database system (Prong 2).

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

As stated above, LEAs who do not meet the transition timeline are unable to correct individual student files for Indicator 12 but did provide documentation that each individual student had eligibility determined and an IEP written for eligible students.

LEAs who are determined not to meet compliance for a second year must complete additional requirements and is placed on a new CAP. In addition to providing training on policies and procedures related to transition timelines, the LEA is also required to complete a desk audit, submit quarterly initial evaluation data, and submit a 100% compliant FFY 2020 report. SEP verified the LEA completed requirements in the new CAP and was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements based upon a review of updated data (prong 2) for FFY 2020.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State did not provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2019. The State must provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2020 in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR.

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

The State reported, in its narrative, "SEP advised LEAs to report Part C to Part B transition students in Indicator 11 for FFY 2020-2021, if the student was evaluated after their third birthday and after July 1, 2020. Students transitioning from Part C to Part B 619 must be evaluated and an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday, therefore no flexibilities to Indicator 12 timelines are allowed. LEAs could have extended the evaluation timeline in accordance with Administrative Rules of South Dakota 25:05:25:03 - Preplacement Evaluation. However, if the LEA extended the initial evaluation timeline due to COVID19 closures or the parent refused and the extension surpassed the student's third birthday, the LEA did not meet Indicator 12 transition requirement."

OSEP reminds the State that Indicator 12 measures the percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. The measurement for Indicator 12 includes categories such as the number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination. Therefore, the State is required to report children referred by Part C prior to age 3, even if a student is evaluated after their third birthday, in its Indicator 12 data for FFY 2020 and all other reporting years.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

On the initial submission of the FFY 2019 data there was a misunderstanding on how to report students whose transition timeline was missed due to COVID19 but had not yet been verified. During clarification, the OSEP representative and SEP discussed the compliance issues stemming specifically from COVID19. SEP prepared a corrected data submission, however the data did not save correctly in EMAPs during the clarification window. Therefore, correct data for FFY 2019 is included below and SEP issued a CAP to each LEA that had individual files of noncompliance identified.

Correct data for FFY 2019 follows:

Fifteen of the 149 LEAs (total of 26 students), did not meet the FFY 2019 100% target. In FFY 2019 the percent of Part C students transitioned to Part B by their third birthday was 94.20%. The reasons for failure to meet the student's third birthday timeline were due to the evaluation process starting less than 30 calendar days prior to the student's third birthday, staff unaware of timeline for Birth-3 transition students, and LEAs not conducting transition evaluations due to COVID19 closures. Three of the 15 LEAs had continued noncompliance from FFY2018 received a CAP for a second consecutive year. The remaining 12 of the 15 LEAs found out of compliance were in compliance in FFY 2018.

- Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination. 639
- Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday. 146
- Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. 422

d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied. 15

e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays. 30

f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option. 0

SEP verified LEAs completed the evaluations through student file desk audits submitted to SEP.

Range of days beyond timeline:

Reported in SPP FFY 2019:

2 students exceeded by 1 day

1 student exceeded by 8 days

1 student exceeded by 36 days

Additional 22 students reported during clarification process.

1 student exceeded by 31 days

1 student exceeded by 47 days

1 student exceeded by 50 days

1 student exceeded by 72 days

1 student exceeded by 84 days

1 student exceeded by 89 days

1 student exceeded by 93 days

1 student exceeded by 94 days

1 student exceeded by 95 days

1 student exceeded by 110 days

1 student exceeded by 118 days

1 student exceeded by 121 days

1 student exceeded by 134 days

1 student exceeded by 137 days

1 student exceeded by 143 days

1 student exceeded by 144 days

1 student exceeded by 149 days

1 student exceeded by 150 days

1 student exceeded by 153 days

1 student exceeded by 160 days

1 student exceeded by 170 days

1 student exceeded by 180 days

12 - OSEP Response

12 - Required Actions

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

If a State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16, the State may, but is not required to, choose to include youth beginning at that younger age in its data for this indicator. If a State chooses to do this, it must state this clearly in its SPP/APR and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

13 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2009	100.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	82.02%	90.29%	93.71%	83.97%	87.18%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
85	128	87.18%	100%	66.41%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

One year prior to each LEA review SEP and TSLP's review requirements and provide technical assistance on transition requirements. COVID19 closures impacted LEAs ability to participate in virtual trainings; LEAs were limited in being able to request or accept additional technical assistance when offered; LEAs were unable to receive the appropriate consent to invite outside agencies with limited access to parents; and high staff turn-over made transition planning more difficult as new teachers built relationships with the students, families, and the community.

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State monitoring

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

Indicator 13 data is collected during accountability reviews. LEAs receive an accountability review once during a five-year cycle. Reviewers utilize the Indicator 13 checklist to review files for each case manager and disability category in the LEA. The checklist includes evidence that the measurable post-secondary goals were based on an age-appropriate transition assessment, appropriate measurable postsecondary goal(s), goals updated annually, included courses of study that will reasonably enable the student to meet his/ her postsecondary goals, include transition services/activities to help with postsecondary goals, annual goal(s) related to transition service's needs, evidence the student was invited to the meeting, and evidence that a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP team meeting with prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority. To be found compliant, LEAs must demonstrate appropriate procedures in all areas, in all files reviewed. A minimum of one file from each of the disability categories represented and two files from each case manager are reviewed.

Question	Yes / No
Do the State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?	NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Stakeholders were asked for suggestions on how to help LEAs with transition planning. The conversation started around what the barriers were such as information not getting down to the teacher level, parents not understanding the importance of transition planning, new high school special educators not being prepared for transition planning, and conducting conversations with parents at a high level rather than at a parent-friendly level. The strategies suggested by the stakeholders included: using google classroom to develop a Professional Learning Community (PLC) for high school special educators; providing training to pre-service educators at the university to better prepare them for the classroom; highlighting LEAs that are doing transition well; ensure the language in transition planning documents is in parent-friendly language.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
25	25	0	0

FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

In FFY 2019, SEP identified 25 individual files of noncompliance in eight LEAs. Eight LEAs received a CAP. In the CAP, LEAs corrected the individual files of noncompliance. The LEAs were required to undergo training and update policies and procedures around the area of noncompliance identified. SEP verified that 18 individual files were corrected. For the seven files that could not be corrected as the outside agency was invited to the IEP meeting prior to receiving consent, training was provided, and an additional file was submitted showing the correct process and procedure. All students received the services as indicated in the IEP, and policies and procedures were updated. The LEAs submitted additional files to verify correction and correct implementation of regulatory requirements. SEP verified that all eight LEAs implemented the regulatory requirements with 100% compliance. Indicator 13 is collected during accountability reviews. LEAs must have all disability categories represented and two files per case manager available for the reviewers collecting Indicator 13 data. When an issue of noncompliance is identified in a file, the LEA is required, through a CAP, to correct the individual file issue within one year of the date of the report. The correction is verified upon submission of the documentation either through a transition report, documentation of consent to invite an outside agency, an updated transition IEP, a meeting notice or a student invite, or a parental prior written notice.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

All eight of the LEAs corrected and submitted each individual student file with 100% compliance. The LEAs were also required to submit additional student files to verify they were maintaining 100% compliance.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

All eight of the LEAs corrected and submitted each individual student file with 100% compliance. The LEAs were also required to submit additional student files to verify they were maintaining 100% compliance.

13 - OSEP Response

13 - Required Actions

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Results indicator: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

- A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.
- B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.
- C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

A. Percent enrolled in higher education = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school)}}{\text{(\# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)}} \right] \times 100$.

B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school)}}{\text{(\# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)}} \right] \times 100$.

C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment)}}{\text{(\# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)}} \right] \times 100$.

Instructions

Sampling of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Collect data by September 2021 on students who left school during 2019-2020, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2019-2020 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

I. Definitions

Enrolled in higher education as used in measures A, B, and C means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis in a community college (two-year program) or college/university (four or more year program) for at least one complete term, at any time in the year since leaving high school.

Competitive employment as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under “competitive employment”:

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

Option 2: States report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a “part-time basis” under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

Enrolled in other postsecondary education or training as used in measure C, means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis for at least 1 complete term at any time in the year since leaving high school in an education or training program (e.g., Job Corps, adult education, workforce development program, vocational technical school which is less than a two-year program).

Some other employment as used in measure C means youth have worked for pay or been self-employed for a period of at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes working in a family business (e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering services, etc.).

II. Data Reporting

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

Provide the total number of targeted youth in the sample or census.

Provide the actual numbers for each of the following mutually exclusive categories. The actual number of “leavers” who are:

1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;
2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education);
3. Enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed);
4. In some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).

“Leavers” should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, “leavers” who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also

happen to be employed. Likewise, "leavers" who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2020 response rate to the FFY 2019 response rate), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

Targets must be established for measures A, B, and C.

Measure A: For purposes of reporting on the measures/indicators, please note that any youth enrolled in an institution of higher education (that meets any definition of this term in the Higher Education Act (HEA)) within one year of leaving high school must be reported under measure A. This could include youth who also happen to be competitively employed, or in some other training program; however, the key outcome we are interested in here is enrollment in higher education.

Measure B: All youth reported under measure A should also be reported under measure B, in addition to all youth that obtain competitive employment within one year of leaving high school.

Measure C: All youth reported under measures A and B should also be reported under measure C, in addition to youth that are enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program, or in some other employment.

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States should consider categories such as race/ethnicity, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the response data are not representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State collected the data.

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due Feb. 1, 2023, when reporting the extent to which the demographics of respondents are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, States must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	2020	Target >=	15.50%	15.50%	15.50%	15.50%	15.50%
A	11.04%	Data	15.79%	20.53%	27.35%	16.93%	22.96%
B	2020	Target >=	67.50%	68.00%	68.50%	68.50%	68.50%
B	61.96%	Data	76.56%	76.00%	65.81%	70.61%	66.35%
C	2020	Target >=	81.00%	81.00%	81.50%	82.00%	82.00%
C	77.30%	Data	82.06%	82.67%	78.63%	82.11%	80.82%

FFY 2020 Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	11.04%	11.50%	12.50%	14.00%	15.50%	17.00%
Target B >=	61.96%	63.00%	64.50%	66.00%	67.50%	69.50%
Target C >=	77.30%	78.00%	79.00%	80.00%	81.00%	82.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

FFY 2020 survey response data was not yet available at the summer stakeholder meeting, so stakeholders looked at historical data, had discussion regarding COVID19 impact, and made suggestions based on projections available. Stakeholders expressed that COVID19 would affect the data and there could be a possible decrease in all areas due to not being able to contact exiters, limited job availability and supports, and anxiety in returning to face to face contact both in post-secondary and the workforce. Stakeholders looked at and considered the actual response rate decline and the potential continuation of the response decline in their discussions around target setting. Stakeholders determined that targets should be set in a manner that would allow time for employment and post-school attendance to recover and rebound from the impact of COVID19 with minimal target increases in the first few years and more ambitious growth at the end of the 5-year target period.

Based on the significant impact COVID19 had on the opportunities for students to engage in employment and post-secondary opportunities, review of the response rate, and the additional methods to target and engage students in responding it was determined that the baseline should be reset to FFY 2020. Stakeholders had a long discussion regarding the impact of COVID19 currently and in the future for post-school outcomes. The response rate was impacted by students not responding to survey requests and a decrease in LEA volunteers being available to facilitate survey engagement and responses. The LEAs have been instrumental in assisting SEP to meet representativeness for the survey and hard to reach students, however their capacity was limited during this collection period due to increased demands and illness due to COVID19. As it became apparent that LEA volunteers had decreased and would not be able to generate the number of responses they had in previous collections, SEP followed up with state-level consultants to increase contacts with students.

SD added questions to the survey regarding the impact of COVID19 on post-school outcomes. Of the 94 youth that responded to the COVID19 questions: 14 indicated they had lost jobs, 35 had hours cut, 19 were not comfortable working, and 12 were not comfortable attending school. Other stakeholders supported this information in their identified field of work with responses of limited jobs in individual skill areas and anxiety to return to in-person employment or education. This data reinforced the significant impact COVID19 had and that it was appropriate to reset the baseline to FFY 2020.

Indicator 14A: The stakeholders discussed the possible COVID19 impact on students being able and willing to enroll in universities. While universities offered virtual learning opportunities not all students learn effectively in this manner. Some students were concerned with having to return to face-to-face learning due to medical concerns.

Indicator 14B: Stakeholders discussed COVID19 impact on competitive employment. Many businesses were closed during the time these exiters would have been employed. When businesses did open, some exiters were concerned about returning to the workforce due to health reasons personally or within their household. Additionally, there may have been less support available to find and get training for jobs, if eligible through Vocational Rehabilitation (VR), due to support being provided virtually rather than face to face and staffing shortages. This was further compounded due to some youth not having access to virtual options.

Indicator 14C: Stakeholder discussion focused on the uncertainty of what the COVID19 impact would be. Potential factors identified included is exiters would remain at home due to medical, emotional, or motivational reasons; if they had been engaged but left would they return to school and/or jobs; would there be an increase in job availability, or would there be a domino effect of all factors. With that discussion, it was determined to set a less aggressive target in the initial years with a larger increase at the end of the SPP package with the option of revisiting and adjusting targets in the future if outlooks improved and COVID19 impact was not as significant as anticipated.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	688
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	163
Response Rate	23.69%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	18
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	83
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	5
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	20

Measure	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	18	163	22.96%	11.04%	11.04%	N/A	N/A
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	101	163	66.35%	61.96%	61.96%	N/A	N/A
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary	126	163	80.82%	77.30%	77.30%	N/A	N/A

Measure	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)							

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

Response Rate

FFY	2019	2020
Response Rate	42.90%	23.69%

Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

Strategies that will be implemented for hard-to-find youth include: pre-notification postcards reminding youth of upcoming survey; creating familiarity with the survey through posting a sample copy online and providing that sample copy to LEAs; utilizing and offering an online survey to youth rather than the paper version or a phone call; target calls in the areas for the underrepresented; enlist LEA's to help with calling the exiters.

Strategies that will be used to increase the response rate in the underrepresented minority groups, males, and urban students include: contacting districts with high minority populations and developing a plan to increase the response rate; working with districts on ways to get leavers to respond to the survey, such as providing a draft copy of the survey so leavers understand what will be asked; work with the district to ensure most current email and phone numbers are provided at the time the student leaves school which will be utilized in sending the link to the online survey and provide a way to call if the online survey isn't used. Query districts with a high response rate for strategies that have been effective, especially those with higher participation rates among underrepresented minority groups. Reach out to districts with low response rates to discuss strategies and develop a plan to raise their response rates.

Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

SD used the National Post School Outcome (NPSO) response rate calculator to calculate response representativeness in the following areas: 1) Disability, 2) Ethnicity, 3) Gender and 4) Exit Status to determine if the respondent group of students was similar to the total population of exiters for 2019-2020 school year. According to the NPSO Response Rate Calculator, differences between the Respondent Group and the Target Leaver Group of + 3% are important. Negative differences indicate an under-representation of the group and a positive difference indicates over-representation.

Across the nation, several states indicated their response rates were steady but overall engagement rates were lower. Several other states experienced lower response rates like SD. Collectors of data across the United States mentioned several possible factors for lower response rates, several of which are applicable in SD. These factors include (1) contact phone numbers are less and less accurate each year, even with the enhanced phone list; (2) respondents are more skeptical of answering survey questions over the phone than they were in the past. Research has shown that fewer calls are answered, on average, due to caller ID. When people see an unfamiliar phone number come up on their phone, they are not likely to answer. National trends indicate that while in quarantine, people were more hesitant to take calls and click on survey links.; (3) Several of the teachers who have consistently collected data in the past did not contribute this year and this is likely due to teacher burnout. This can be attributed to the heavy workload brought upon educators throughout and following the COVID19 pandemic and general fatigue.

This was the first year SD tried using an online survey instead of mailing hard copies. SD received approximately the same number of returned online surveys as hard copies in years past. The online survey is more efficient and cost-effective. It is likely that response rates will increase each year with the continued use of electronic surveys as opposed to paper copies.

SD had a significant decrease in response rate in some minority subgroups. This decrease could contribute to nonresponse bias and cause variance in overall engagement, however, due to the pandemic and other data variables unique to this reporting year it will be important to continue to analyze future response rates and demographics to make meaningful long-term inferences.

Strategies to be used to correct underrepresentation include: increase response rate particularly in the areas for minority students by contacting districts with high minority populations and developing plans to increase response rate; working with districts on ways to get leavers to respond to the survey, such as providing a draft copy of the survey so leavers understand what will be asked; work with districts identified with high minority populations and low response rates to ensure most current email and phone numbers are provided at the time the student leaves school which will be utilized in sending the link to the online survey and provide a way to call if the online survey isn't used. Ask districts with a high response rate for strategies that have been

effective, especially those with higher participation rates among underrepresented minority groups and share those strategies with districts identified with high minority populations and low response rates.

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

The categories of respondents in the areas of emotional disturbed, all other disabilities, English language learners, and dropout were similar to all target leavers in each area and within the + 3% difference as suggested by the National Post School Outcomes (NPSO) response rate calculator. The categories of learning disability, female and rural exiters were overrepresented in the data gathered in SD in 2019-2020.

According to SD's representativeness data, there were 688 leavers with 163 respondents. The specific learning disability category is most highly represented with 331 leavers but with a depressed response rate with only 65 respondents. Other health impaired (117 leavers, 25 respondents) and cognitive disability (85 leavers, 25 respondents) were the next highest represented categories as leavers, however emotional disturbance (59 leavers, 19 respondents), cognitive disability, and autism (53 leavers, 16 respondents) had nearly identical responder rates. In gender, there were 249 female leavers and 67 respondents while male responses were underrepresented with 439 leavers and 96 responders. In race/ethnicity the white group was the most highly represented with 473 leavers and 110 responders, followed by Native Americans with 105 leavers and 31 responders, while Hispanic/Latino and 2 or more races were most underrepresented in respondents.

In 2017-2018, rural (or geographic location) was a new consideration for determining the representation of respondents. Each state can decide how they want to determine geographic location. This year, rural was calculated by subtracting respondents from two LEAs in urban areas (Sioux Falls and Rapid City). The two urban LEAs were identified by the United States Department of Agriculture Economic Research Service (www.ers.usda.gov) as the largest populated areas in SD. This year's data indicates that 24% of leavers were in the urban LEAs and 76% of leavers were in the rural areas. So, while the NPSO calculator indicates an overrepresented number of rural students surveyed, it's important to note that the majority of South Dakota's population falls under the definition of rural. Therefore, it is extremely unlikely that SEP will ever meet the +/-3 % interval in the category of Rural.

Lastly, while SD typically has an underrepresentation of minority students, the underrepresentation in response is the highest it's been in several years. The frequency of exiters that were Asian, Native Hawaiian and Two or More Races was too small to report. The N size of these respondents by specific ethnicity was below 10. South Dakota's minimum cell size is 10 so any category with fewer exiters than the minimum is not reported separately. Only the Native American, White, Black/African American, and Hispanic/Latino exiters were reported. Noticeably, there was a significant decrease in the percentage of Native American students enrolled in higher education this year. In 2018-2019, 26% of the respondents in Tier 1 were Native American as compared with just 6% this year.

The response data is representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. (yes/no)

NO

If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

Survey coordination and collection begins April 1 following the year students have exited and is collected through September 30. Each student that has left high school the previous year receives an email containing a link to an electronic survey indicating they can complete the survey online or elect to receive a phone call in the near future to collect data on their post-secondary education and employment status.

Taking steps to increase the response rate will help with the representativeness of the demographics. This was the first year SEP tried using an online survey instead of mailing hard copies which resulted in about the same number of responses. It is believed with continuous utilization of the online survey; the response rate will increase. Other strategies include increasing effort to utilize LEA personnel to contact students; using post cards to remind youth about the upcoming survey.

Strategies that will be used to increase response rate, particularly in the areas for minority students, males, and urban include: contacting districts with high minority populations and developing a plan to increase response rate; working with districts on ways to get leavers to respond to the survey, such as providing a draft copy of the survey so leavers understand what will be asked; work with the district to ensure most current email and phone numbers are provided at the time the student leaves school which will be utilized in sending the link to the online survey and provide a way to call if the online survey isn't used. Ask districts with a high response rate for strategies that have been effective, especially those with higher participation rates among Hispanic and Native American populations. Reach out to districts with low response rates to discuss strategies and develop a plan to raise their response rates.

Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

SD uses the NPSO tool to calculate the representativeness of respondents. According to the NPSO Response Rate Calculator, differences between the Respondent Group and the Target Leaver Group of + 3% are important. Negative differences indicate an under-representation of the group and a positive difference indicates over-representation.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO
Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	YES
If yes, attach a copy of the survey	PSO Survey (1)

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The survey was revised to include gathering information about COVID19 impact.

Stakeholders discussed and considered the different demographics that SEAs will report in FFY 2021. South Dakota is divided into 7 geographic regions. Stakeholders recommended using the regions as one of the demographics to report. Stakeholders also recommended reporting responsiveness by disability category. Race/ethnicity, geographic location by regions in SD and disability category data are already collected. SEP is working with the contractor to update the NPSO calculator tool to include the additional demographic categories. This will be ready for the FFY 2021 submission.

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2020 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

A continued over representation of the learning disability category may be caused by the under representation of the cognitive disability. Last year this over representation was caused by the under representation of all other disabilities group. For the minority student's category there was an over representation last year and now there is an under representation. There were fewer respondents this year from LEAs that in the past have had many respondents and LEA volunteer callers were fewer this reporting period.

SD will implement additional strategies to increase the response rate such as: enlist the help of LEAs in areas of over or under representation, use post cards to remind youth about the upcoming survey; create a sample version of survey to share with LEAs and youth so create familiarity with the survey.

14 - OSEP Response

14 - Required Actions

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results Indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/03/2021	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	2
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/03/2021	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	2

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Indicator 15 data was reported to the SDAPCD on September 29, 2021. Panel members reviewed information on common issues identified as noncompliance in both state complaints and due process hearing requests as well as current improvement strategies used. The panel suggested SEP look at improving parent awareness of dispute resolution options and how to utilize their options. SEP also presented the SPP data to the July 2021 stakeholder group, SDPC, and through the public comment website to gain feedback on improvement strategies where it was also suggested SEP look at targeting parents so they are better informed.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=					
Data		100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=						

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
2	2	0.00%		100.00%	N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

SD has less than 10 resolutions for FFY 2020, therefore no targets have been set. SEP received did not identify any significant impacts to the number of requests for due process hearings due to COVID19. The number of requests received was average for SD.

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15 - OSEP Response

15 - Required Actions

Indicator 16: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

Percent = (2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(ii)) divided by 2.1 times 100.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution mediations reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

16 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1 Mediations held	3
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	1
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	0

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

YES

If yes, provide an explanation below

The state reported the numbers above, however, it was determined that 2.1.b.i is incorrect. There were 2 mediations outside of due process complaints that were mediated and an agreement was written. Corrections will be made during the EdFacts correction period in May 2022.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Indicator 16 data was reported to the SDAPCD on September 29, 2021. Panel members reviewed information on common issues identified as non-compliance in both state complaints and due process hearing requests as well as current improvement strategies used. The panel suggested SEP look at improving parent awareness of dispute resolution options and how to utilize their options. SEP also presented the SPP data to the July 2021 stakeholder group, SDPC, and through the public comment website to gain feedback on improvement strategies where it was also suggested SEP look at targeting parents so they are better informed.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=					
Data	100.00%	100.00%	62.50%	100.00%	100.00%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
-----	------	------	------	------	------	------

Target >=						
--------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
1	0	3	100.00%		33.33%	N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

SD has less than 10 mediations for FFY 2020, therefore no targets have been set. SEP did not see any significant impacts of COVID19 to the number of mediation requests received. SD receives between 3 to 7 requests per year, FFY 2020 data fell within the average number of requests for a given year.

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16 - OSEP Response

16 - Required Actions

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Measurement

The State's SPP/APR includes an SSIP that is a comprehensive, ambitious, yet achievable multi-year plan for improving results for children with disabilities. The SSIP includes each of the components described below.

Instructions

Baseline Data: The State must provide baseline data that must be expressed as a percentage and which is aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

Targets: In its FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. The State's FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State's baseline data.

Updated Data: In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 2, 2022, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

It is of the utmost importance to improve results for children with disabilities by improving educational services, including special education and related services. Stakeholders, including parents of children with disabilities, local educational agencies, the State Advisory Panel, and others, are critical participants in improving results for children with disabilities and should be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the State's targets under Indicator 17. The SSIP should include information about stakeholder involvement in all three phases.

Phase I: Analysis:

- Data Analysis;
- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;
- State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities;
- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and
- Theory of Action.

Phase II: Plan (which, in addition to the Phase I content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Infrastructure Development;
- Support for local educational agency (LEA) Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and
- Evaluation.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation (which, in addition to the Phase I and Phase II content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP

Refer to FFY 2013-2015 Measurement Table for detailed requirements of Phase I and Phase II SSIP submissions.

Phase III should only include information from Phase I or Phase II if changes or revisions are being made by the State and/or if information previously required in Phase I or Phase II was not reported.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation

In Phase III, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. This includes: (A) data and analysis on the extent to which the State has made progress toward and/or met the State-established short-term and long-term outcomes or objectives for implementation of the SSIP and its progress toward achieving the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities (SiMR); (B) the rationale for any revisions that were made, or that the State intends to make, to the SSIP as the result of implementation, analysis, and evaluation; and (C) a description of the meaningful stakeholder engagement. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

A. Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2020 through 2025 SPP/APR, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, e.g., a logic model, of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., Feb 2021). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022).

The State must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (i.e., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes,

and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (i.e., progress monitoring data) that was collected to support the on-going use of the evidence-based practices and inform decision-making for the next year of SSIP implementation.

C. Stakeholder Engagement

The State must describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts and how the State addressed concerns, if any, raised by stakeholders through its engagement activities.

Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

17 - Indicator Data

Section A: Data Analysis

What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)?

The SEP FFY 2020 State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR) indicates that students with specific learning disabilities (SLD) will increase reading proficiency prior to 4th grade from 4.84% in spring 2015 to 44.49% by Spring 2020 as measured by the Statewide assessment.

Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission? (yes/no)

NO

Is the State using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model)? (yes/no)

YES

Provide a description of the subset of the population from the indicator.

SEP collected data from 16 schools in seven LEAs that are participating in the State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG).

Is the State's theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

NO

Please provide a link to the current theory of action.

https://www.dropbox.com/s/zsl017o39b1vktu/SD%20Theory%20of%20Action_508%20compliant.docx?dl=0

Does the State intend to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications? (yes/no)

NO

If no, describe any changes to the activities, strategies or timelines described in the previous submission and include a rationale or justification for the changes.

Although the SiMR did not change for this reporting period (2020-2021), the SiMR has changed for the 2021-2022 school year. The revised SiMR will include students with specific learning disabilities, speech and language disabilities, and other health impairments. With this change, the Theory of Action will be updated to reflect the new subgroups of students and strategies to improve student outcomes. The Theory of Action for FFY 2020 can be viewed at https://www.dropbox.com/s/zsl017o39b1vktu/SD%20Theory%20of%20Action_508%20compliant.docx?dl=0. Stakeholders will meet to consider resetting the baseline data year and targets prior to FFY 2021 submission.

Progress toward the SiMR

Please provide the data for the specific FFY listed below (expressed as actual number and percentages).

Select yes if the State uses two targets for measurement. (yes/no)

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2014-2015	16.59%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target>=	17.49%	18.12%	18.75%	19.37%	20.62%	23.12%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of test-takers scoring proficient or above	Number of test-takers	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
20	222		17.49%	9.01%	Did not meet target	N/A

Provide the data source for the FFY 2020 data.

Data for this indicator is collected through the SD English Language Arts statewide assessment.

Please describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR.

Data for this indicator is collected and analyzed in the standardized method required by the SD English Language Arts Statewide Assessment. For the data analysis, the proficiency rates were used.

Optional: Has the State collected additional data (i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey) that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? (yes/no)

YES

Describe any additional data collected by the State to assess progress toward the SiMR.

2020-2021 School Year:

Benchmark data from 2020-2021 for participating LEAs shows mixed results. While benchmark data for grade 3 students with SLD (the target group for the SiMR) shows a decrease in the percentage of students scoring at benchmark, grades K, 1, 4, and 5 students with SLD showed an increase.

The percentage of students with SLD scoring at benchmark in fall 2020 and winter 2021:

Grades K-5: increased (15.7% to 19.5%)

Kindergarten: increased (14.3% to 28.6%)

Grade 1: increased (0.0% to 4.3%)

Grade 2: stayed the same (25.0% to 25.0%)

Grade 3: decreased (12.2% to 2.0%)

Grade 4: increased (18.4% to 26.5%)

Grade 5: increased (19.4% to 30.6%)

Across grades K-5, there was an increase in the percentage of students with SLD scoring proficient from fall to winter of 3.8 percentage points. This compares to an increase of 2.3 percentage points for all SWD and an increase of all students (with and without disabilities) of 6.9 percentage points.

The evaluation measures included in the combined evaluation plan allow DOE to assess outcomes achieved in each infrastructure improvement strategy. The evaluation plan can be viewed at <https://doe.sd.gov/grants/documents/SPDG-EvalPlan-21.pdf>.

Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? (yes/no)

YES

If data for this reporting period were impacted specifically by COVID-19, the State must include in the narrative for the indicator: (1) the impact on data completeness, validity and reliability for the indicator; (2) an explanation of how COVID-19 specifically impacted the State's ability to collect the data for the indicator; and (3) any steps the State took to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the data collection.

COVID19 impacted data completeness for this indicator. LEAs continue to implement mitigation strategies including school closures and hybrid and online learning schedules. These mitigation strategies provide unique learning environments and may change the amount of instructional time a student receives. The strategies also impact the number of students who are completing assessments, especially those who are medically fragile. To mitigate the impact of COVID19 on data collection, SEP provided resources to LEAs on completing local assessments, including benchmark assessments, on a staggered timeline or using virtual formats.

Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

Please provide a link to the State's current evaluation plan.

<https://doe.sd.gov/grants/documents/SPDG-EvalPlan-21.pdf>

Is the State's evaluation plan new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, provide a description of the changes and updates to the evaluation plan.

SEP aligned the SSIP evaluation plan with both the SPDG and MTSS evaluation plans. Beginning in 2021-2022, all three initiatives shared one common evaluation plan. The evaluation plan includes data collected on professional development, implementation fidelity, and student outcomes in the areas of MTSS/Data-Driven Decision Making, Literacy/Instruction, Coaching, and Family Engagement. The detailed plan can be found at <https://doe.sd.gov/grants/documents/SPDG-EvalPlan-21.pdf>.

If yes, describe a rationale or justification for the changes to the SSIP evaluation plan.

SEP continues to work on aligning initiatives that share a common focus. Developing one common evaluation plan allows for data across initiatives to be collected and reviewed consistently. As DOE develops a state literacy plan and increases cross-division collaboration, this common evaluation plan can be used to collect data on effective implementation across all LEAs.

Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period:

The four infrastructure improvement strategies are: 1) MTSS/Data-Driven Decision Making, 2) Literacy/Instruction, 3) Coaching, and 4) Family Engagement. Each of the standards of action have improvement strategies within them. DOE continues to implement activities within each of these standards of action.

MTSS/Data-Driven Decision Making

General education and special education teachers in participating schools continue to take part in data analysis trainings and facilitated student data reviews. Data analysis trainings provide LEAs with a process and tools to review student benchmark data to determine instructional effectiveness and student need. Facilitated student data reviews provide grade-level teams with a process and tools for reviewing ongoing progress monitoring data to

adjust intervention supports. LEAs continue to use data to drive instructional planning for core classroom and intervention groups.

Literacy/Instruction

SEP continues to partner with other DOE divisions to provide annual training in foundational literacy using the Teaching Reading Sourcebook. The training continues to be open to all LEAs in SD. Foundational literacy training provides a basic understanding of literacy skills (phonological awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension) along with modeling and practice of evidence-based instructional strategies. Participants leave the training with a copy of the Teaching Reading Sourcebook, visual aides, and the knowledge and skills needed to provide effective instruction in their respective classrooms.

Coaching

Participating LEAs continue to receive coaching supports from their respective LEA coaches. Coaches conduct fall walkthroughs to collect data and determine the level of support needed by educators. Coaches develop a coaching plan and provide differentiated coaching cycles to teachers based on data collected. Coaching cycles include a pre-conference, lesson observation or modeling, and debrief. Coaches continue to receive ongoing training and supports from a state coaching coordinator through monthly meetings and quarterly trainings. The meetings and trainings provide continuous support on collecting coaching data, implementing coaching cycles, and working through challenging conversations and situations. The state coaching coordinator conducts annual site visits to coaches to observe the coaches and provide specific feedback on effective coaching practices.

Family Engagement

Through a partnership with SDPC, SEP continues to provide training and support to participating LEAs in the implementation of family literacy modules. Modules 1 and 2 focus on phonological awareness and decoding skills. Modules 3 and 4 focus on reading fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. Modules 1 and 3 can be offered face to face or completed online using the guided Nearpod training housed on the Read to Succeed website (<http://bit.ly/ReadtoSucceedSD>). Modules 2 and 4 are self-paced online activities completed by participants in the Read to Succeed website. These modules provide a basic understanding of foundational literacy skills and activities that families can do at home to build literacy skills. SEP continues to provide weekly family literacy tips to LEAs that can be included in newsletters, websites, and social media.

Ongoing infrastructure analysis and improvement efforts continue to focus on alignment across common initiatives, including MTSS, SPDG, and SSIP. Intentional planning meetings continue to be held with leadership and key stakeholders from SSIP, MTSS and SPDG to discuss ongoing alignment efforts.

Describe the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategy during the reporting period including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Please relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up.

MTSS/Data-Driven Decision Making

LEAs participated in 16 trainings on data-driven decision-making strategies. 117 participants (including general education teachers, special education teachers, and school administrators) responded to training evaluations. 91% of survey respondents indicated that the trainings were useful, 97% stated that their work-related knowledge increased, and 97% stated that the workshops will positively impact students.

Literacy/Instruction

Instructional coaches and state trainers provided 49 literacy or instruction trainings to participating LEAs. 245 participants (including general education teachers, special education teachers, and school administrators) responded to training evaluations. 87% of survey respondents indicated that the trainings were useful, 98% stated that their work-related knowledge increased, and 92% stated that the workshops will positively impact students.

Coaching

208 staff members from participating LEAs completed a coaching survey. 80% of survey respondents stated that they were satisfied or very satisfied with support received by the coach. Coaches at participating LEAs completed 2,340 coaching activities during the 2020-2021 school year. The coaching activities include pre-conference meetings, classroom demonstrations, classroom observations, and post-conference debriefings.

Family Engagement

During the 2020-2021 school year, SEP shared access to a Read to Succeed Online Family Literacy training to participating LEAs. The website was also shared with other LEAs upon request. As of June 30, 2021, there were 384 unique clicks on the website. 12 families completed a training evaluation upon completion of the website training modules. 100% of respondents stated that the workshop presentation was of high quality, 100% stated that they would recommend the workshop to others.

Did the State implement any new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? (yes/no)

YES

Describe each new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategy and the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved.

DOE implemented the following new infrastructure improvement strategies in the areas identified below:

MTSS/Data-Driven Decision Making

SEP is developing a data website that will allow LEAs to enter data and review reports included in the evaluation plan. The detailed plan can be found at <https://doe.sd.gov/grants/documents/SPDG-EvalPlan-21.pdf>. This will provide LEAs with more frequent opportunities to review data and implementation progress.

Literacy/Instruction

Survey feedback from literacy trainings indicated a need for trainings focused on research and evidence-based practices that support struggling readers. In response to this feedback, SEP developed a monthly training series highlighting research and evidence-based practices. Topics included phonemic awareness proficiency, teaching spelling using a structured literacy approach, assessment and intervention for word-level reading problems, classroom- and systems- approaches to supporting students with dyslexia, and structured literacy for English Language Learners. Each training includes viewing of a pre-recorded webinar, breakout conversation, and Q&A with literacy experts. This series is open to all SD educators.

DOE is in the early stages of developing a State Literacy Plan. This plan will provide consistent training and support to all LEAs. DOE held a cross-division meeting in May 2021 to begin planning for a state literacy plan. Participants reviewed other state literacy plans, identified areas to include and avoid, and began developing a long-range plan for literacy plan development. DOE held a stakeholder meeting in November 2021 to gather stakeholder input on the plan. Stakeholders included parents, educators, school administrators, higher education representatives, MTSS consultants, and local

business members. Stakeholders provided recommendations for plan content, suggestions for members of the plan development team, and procedures for collecting feedback during and after plan development. DOE will begin plan development in summer 2022. Data collected on effectiveness of the trainings and supports provided through SSIP, SPDG, and MTSS continue to guide the strategies and evaluation plans for the state literacy plan.

Coaching

SEP added a coaching component to the MTSS initiative. The coaching component provides a contracted coach to participating districts. The coach conducts walkthroughs to collect data on the needs of teachers, develops a differentiated support plan based on the data collected, and provides coaching cycles to teachers throughout the school year. Three LEAs are currently receiving coaching supports from an MTSS coach and four LEAs are receiving coaching consultation supports for an LEA-employed coach through the MTSS initiative.

Family Engagement

SEP provided a Train the Trainer event for all LEAs interested in implementing the family literacy modules. This training equips LEAs to facilitate the family literacy training independently. Training includes presentation materials, hands-on activities, and presenter notes for each of the literacy modules. Participants left ready to present the literacy modules to families in their respective LEAs.

Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

MTSS/Data-Driven Decision Making

SEP will review the current trainings offered in the area of data-driven decision making. A team will review and update the training to reflect the assessment tools and resources used by LEAs. SEP will also launch a data website and provide training for LEAs on accessing the website, entering data, and reviewing reports.

Literacy/Instruction

SEP will continue to partner with divisions across DOE to provide a variety of evidence-based foundational literacy trainings for all LEAs. SEP is developing a dyslexia training for teachers. This training will be offered to all educators in summer 2022, and will be offered annually after that. DOE will continue work on the state literacy plan. DOE is currently requesting proposals for technical assistance in planning, developing, and implementing the plan. Workgroups will begin the planning phase of the literacy plan in summer 2022, with the roll out scheduled for fall 2022.

Coaching

Feedback from LEAs indicates an increasing desire for virtual coaching supports and resources. Virtual coaching can provide supports to LEAs without concern for extensive rural travel, weather delays, and schools closed to outside visitors during COVID19 protocols. SEP will continue to explore options for providing virtual coaching to LEAs. The DOE Division of Learning and Instruction (DLI) has had success using SWIVL cameras and software for the DOE mentoring program, so SEP is working on partnering with DLI on best practices for program development and implementation for the coaching component of the SSIP.

Family Engagement

SEP continues to work across divisions to provide access to family literacy resources. SEP will continue providing Train the Trainer events to equip more LEAs in the family literacy trainings. The Train the Trainer events are open to participants who have completed the state-offered Foundational Literacy training. Train the Trainer participants to leave with copies of all presentation materials, trainer notes, and ample practice in delivering the training content. SEP will continue to review and update the family literacy website tools and resources provided to LEAs. SEP developed a Read to Succeed family literacy website. The website can be viewed at <http://bit.ly/ReadtoSucceedSD>. This website contains family-friendly definitions of common literacy terms and includes fun activities families can complete to build on literacy skills at home and in the community. The website also includes four training modules that families can complete on their own or as part of a facilitated training at the district.

List the selected evidence-based practices implement in the reporting period:

Foundational Literacy Training
LETRS Training Cohorts
Facilitated Coaching Supports

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.

Foundational Literacy Training

SEP continues to partner with other divisions in DOE to offer summer Foundational Literacy training to all LEAs. This training provides a basic understanding of foundational literacy using the Teaching Reading Sourcebook. This training is ideal for new teachers, as well as experienced teachers who would like to strengthen their understanding and refine teaching practices. Providing continued training in foundational literacy will strengthen the knowledge and skills of teachers and build a common understanding across LEAs. With improved knowledge and skills, teachers can provide effective instruction which will improve outcomes for all students, including students with specific learning disabilities, other health impairments, and speech and language disabilities.

LETRS Training Cohorts

During the 2020-2021 school year, SEP offered a two-year LETRS training cohort. This training was open to coaches and leadership in LEAs. The cohort completed Modules 1-4 during the 2020-2021 school year and will complete Modules 5-8 during the 2021-2022 school year. A second LETRS cohort will complete Modules 1-4 during the 2021-2022 school year and Modules 5-8 during the 2022-2023 school year. LETRS training provides an in-depth understanding of foundational literacy skills. Participants who complete this training will have a deep understanding of foundational literacy research and evidence-based instructional practices. Participants will also have tools to identify and support struggling readers, including those with dyslexia.

Facilitated Coaching Supports

SEP continues to facilitate coaching supports in participating LEAs. SEP offers annual coach training using the Jackson Coaching model to all LEAs. Instructional coaches and LEA leadership attend this training to develop strong coaching supports in their buildings. When teachers are provided ongoing coaching supports, they are receiving job-embedded professional development and opportunities for ongoing feedback and refinement of instructional strategies. This will lead to improved instruction and improved outcomes for all students, including students with specific learning disabilities, other health impairments, and speech and language disabilities.

Provide a summary of how each evidence-based practice and activities or strategies that support its use, is intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g. behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child /outcomes.

Foundational Literacy Training

Participants in the Foundation Literacy Training receive training in foundational literacy skills. Improved understanding of foundational literacy and skills in providing effective instruction will lead to improved teacher knowledge and instruction. The students receiving this high-quality instruction will demonstrate improved outcomes.

LETRS training cohorts

Participants in the LETRS training cohort receive advanced training in foundational literacy skills. Highly-skilled educators will provide high-quality instruction and supports to students. The students receiving this high-quality instruction will demonstrate improved outcomes.

Facilitated Coaching Supports

Teachers who receive coaching supports are receiving job-embedded professional development. This level of support will lead to improve instructional strategies and improved student outcomes.

Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.

Reading Tiered Fidelity Inventory (R-TFI): 82% of schools indicated that they are implementing the Tier 1 skills with fidelity (fidelity score of 70% or higher), 81% for Tier 2, and 60% for Tier 3.

Classroom Observation Checklist: 80% of teacher participants observed are implementing the literacy strategy skills with fidelity and 57% are implementing explicit instruction skills with fidelity.

Observation Checklist for High-Quality Professional Development (HQPDP) Training: 95% of the trainings observed had 80% or more of the essential elements included in the training.

Describe any additional data (e.g. progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.

SEP collects data on each of the infrastructure areas through the combined evaluation plan. Data is collected and reported at the LEA and state level to be used for continuous feedback and improvement. The 2020-2021 state-level data dashboard report can be found at https://www.dropbox.com/sh/61zntf2bcwdy6wq/AAASoyAls1yqHsm5aL7YCn7Ca/SD%20SPDG%202020-21%20Dashboards/Overall?dl=0&preview=SDSPDGDashboardsReport2020-21_Overall.pdf&subfolder_nav_tracking=1.

SEP collects data on each of the infrastructure areas through the combined evaluation plan. Data is collected and reported at the LEA and state level to be used for continuous feedback and improvement.

MTSS/Data-Driven Decision Making

95-97% of participants indicated that their knowledge/skills increased and they will change what they do on the job as a result of the trainings. From the focus groups conducted in spring 2021:

- 83% of participants said they are implementing the skills in the classroom that they learned in the MTSS/Data-Driven Decision Making trainings.
- 92% of participants said the project positively impacted the Tier 2/Tier 3 interventions that teachers are using and positively impacted students with disabilities receiving Tier 2/Tier 3 interventions.

Literacy/Instruction

91-98% of participants indicated that their knowledge/skills increased and they will change what they do on the job as a result of the trainings. Based on the Intervention Tracking Forms, 24% of students receiving a Tier 2 intervention in November no longer needed intervention supports in May; 18% receiving a Tier 3 intervention moved to a less intensive (Tier 2) intervention in May, and 9% no longer needed intervention supports in May.

Coaching

100% of participants indicated that their knowledge/skills increased; 75% indicated that they will change what they do on the job as a result of the trainings. Based on the focus groups, 100% of teacher participants said that coaches effective in helping K-5 teachers improve literacy components at schools; 100% of coach participants said they are implementing the skills in the schools that they learned in the coaching trainings. From the Coaching Survey, 80% teacher participants said that coaches are effective in helping K-5 teachers improve literacy components at schools.

Family Engagement

Based on the focus groups, 79% of participants said that schools were more welcoming as a result of family engagement efforts through the project.

From the Family Engagement Surveys conducted in fall 2020:

- 78% of family members said that they are engaged in the school.
- 73% of family members said that they are involved in literacy activities with their children.

Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practices and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

Foundational Literacy Training

SEP will continue to partner with the DLI to provide foundational literacy training. The foundational literacy training provides a basic understanding of reading research (phonological awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension) as well as modeling and practice in providing effective reading instruction. This training is held as two summer sessions - one session for Kindergarten through third grade teachers, and a separate session for fourth through eighth grade teachers. SEP will continue to expand trainings to support educators working with students with specific learning disabilities, other health impairments, and speech and language disabilities. These expanded trainings will be embedded into a monthly webinar series on relevant topics and will be open to all educators who work with students in the identified disability categories. Topics will be chosen based on surveys that will be sent to LEAs in spring and summer 2022.

LETRS training cohorts

SEP will continue to facilitate annual LETRS training cohorts. LETRS training is an advanced literacy training for educators who have completed the foundational literacy training. LETRS training includes eight training modules on advanced understanding and application of literacy skills. The two-year cohort cycles will overlap, with the first cohort completing Modules 4-8 while the second cohort is completing Modules 1-4. Training facilitators will be assigned to each cohort to provide guidance and support through the completion of the LETRS training modules.

Facilitated Coaching Supports

SEP will continue to partner with DLI to provide annual coach training. Annual coach training provides instructional coaches with the tools and skills to collect data to determine starting skills for coaching, complete coaching cycles, and troubleshoot challenging coaching situations. SEP will continue to explore ways to partner with DLI in providing virtual coaching supports to participating LEAs. SEP will develop a state coaching network to support all instructional coaches statewide.

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Description of Stakeholder Input

Indicator 17 SSIP baselines and targets were reviewed and determined during the SPDG advisory committee on September 22, 2021. SEP aligned the SSIP with MTSS and SPDG during the 2020-2021 school year and combined stakeholders from those three initiatives to become the SPDG stakeholder group. Stakeholders included educators, administrators, family organizations, higher education representatives, and staff from several divisions of the DOE. The race/ethnicity of the stakeholder group represented primarily white. During the meeting, stakeholders reviewed data from all programs that provide literacy supports to pilot LEAs, including the SPDG, SSIP, and MTSS. The data included disaggregation by initiative, grade, and disability category.

SEP collected additional feedback from a variety of stakeholders through online webinars, recorded webinars, and feedback surveys. Based on the data reviewed for SLD and all disability categories, stakeholders recommended revising and expanding the SiMR for FFY 2021 to include students with specific learning disabilities, other health impairments, and speech and language disabilities as these students would all greatly benefit from the evidence-based practices implemented. The rationale to wait to revise the SiMR until FFY 2021 instead of revising for FFY 2020 was to ensure the SEP and LEAs had time to get in place the recommendations for training, progress monitoring, evaluation, and interventions to add the additional students and disability categories. Additionally, stakeholders expressed concern about adding additional requirements to LEAs and students when they were already facing significant disruptions to learning and attendance due to COVID19.

Since stakeholders recommended adding the two additional disability categories in FFY 2021, the group determined the FFY 2020 target should align to the trajectory for the additional subgroups. The FFY 2020 target was lowered from 44.49% to 17.49%. The FFY 2021 to FFY 2025 would continue trajectory based on the FFY 2020 data reflected with specific learning disabilities, other health impairments, and speech and language disabilities. Stakeholders will review the SiMR, baseline, data and targets to make any additional recommendations and changes based on these recommendations prior to the FFY 2021 submission.

Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.

Prior to the meetings, stakeholders were given access to a Google folder with data from schools participating in SPDG, MTSS, or SSIP. The Google folder also contained copies of the PowerPoint slides and handouts for the meeting. During the virtual meeting, SEP used a variety of tools (e.g., Google Doc feedback forms, real-time polls, and Jamboards) to engage participants and collect feedback. SEP also included multiple meeting hosts to monitor the chat for questions and feedback and to provide technical assistance.

Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (yes/no)

NO

Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.

Not Applicable

Additional Implementation Activities

List any activities not already described that the State intends to implement in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.

Not Applicable

Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.

Not Applicable

Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

COVID19 created barriers for implementation of the SSIP. LEAs continue to implement mitigation strategies including school closures and hybrid and online learning schedules. These mitigation strategies provide unique learning environments and may change the amount of instructional time a student receives. Instructional coaches provided supports to educators in developing and monitoring these varied learning environments to minimize learning loss for students.

Substitute teacher shortages and local guidelines around travel limited the opportunities teachers have to participate in face-to-face professional development. To address this barrier, SEP scheduled several online after-school training opportunities. Providing online training after school provides more opportunities for educators to participate in the training without having to travel or find a substitute for their classroom during the school day.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

17 - OSEP Response

17 - Required Actions